STUDIES OF BUDDHISM IN JAPAN

LLOYD

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
* DEC 18 1908 *
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

Division BL1451
Section .L79

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/wheatamongtaress00lloy

THE WHEAT AMONG THE TARES

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON • BOMBAY • CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK • BOSTON • CHICAGO
ATLANTA • SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

The Wheat among the Tares

STUDIES OF BUDDHISM IN JAPAN

A COLLECTION OF ESSAYS AND LECTURES, GIVING AN UNSYSTEMATIC EXPOSITION OF CERTAIN MISSIONARY PROBLEMS OF THE FAR EAST, WITH A PLEA FOR MORE SYSTEMATIC RESEARCH

BY

THE REV. A. LLOYD, M.A.

LECTURER IN THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY, NAVAL ACADEMY AND HIGHER COMMERCIAL SCHOOL, TOKYO
AND FORMERLY FELLOW OF PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST. MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1908

PREFACE

My book is not what I intended it to be. I had a much larger work, embodying the result of many years of study, actually in the press a few weeks ago, when an unfortunate fire in the printing office in Yokohama destroyed it all, and left me with only a few ashes.

I felt, however, that the Pan-Anglican Conferences in London this summer would give me an opportunity, which I ought not to lose, of presenting to the Christian public of England a plea for the more diligent and sympathetic study by Missionaries and Mission Associations of the religions of the East, and more especially of the Buddhism of Japan and China, in which, as these pages will, I hope, show, they can find the materials for a new Apologetic and a new weapon of attack and defence.

This is no mere Academic question. We in the East know of the awakening of Japan, China, and India, and we know that that awakening is

something more than a mere sharpening of the intellect or an arousing of a commercial spirit. It is a movement fraught with many possibilities, and consequently with many dangers, of conflicting interests and ambitions, to say nothing of the prejudices which come from race, environment, religion, and colour.

I believe that what I have to say in this book will be found helpful, in proportion as it can be developed, in turning the minds of Buddhists towards our Christian faith; it may result, in other words, in the conversion of Buddhism to Christianity. Such a turning would have an incalculable influence in the uplifting of the nations and the promotion of goodwill and peace among the nations of goodwill. My plea, therefore, is for more research and study by the representatives of the Church of the actual beliefs of the people amongst whom they labour.

My book, hastily put together, can boast of no very marked unity of design, though there is a unity of purpose running throughout it. Many of the essays have been printed elsewhere. Some were delivered as lectures before the Asiatic Society of Japan, some were contributed to the columns of the *Japan Mail*, and one appeared last year in the *Catholic World*. The Endowed Research for which I plead would have an influence far wider than the bounds of the religious body that had the

public spirit to found it. All Christians would be only too glad to avail themselves of the materials thus placed at their disposal, and I am convinced that the more light is thrown upon the vast stores of Buddhistic literature in China and the East, the more clearly will come out into indisputable certainty the historic Truth of the Great Facts upon which is based our common Christian and Catholic Creed, so that we may hope for a secondary result in the drawing closer together of the disunited forces of Christianity.

A. LLOYD.

Tokyo,
Feast of the Annunciation, 1908.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE v

INTRODUCTORY SONNETS xi

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY 1

CHAPTER II

ON THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION . . 13

CHAPTER III

THE REJECTED STONE 19

CHAPTER IV

BUDDHISM IN CHINA AND JAPAN—

(*a*) KŌBŌ DAISHI AND HIS INDEBTEDNESS TO MANICHAEISM 37

CHAPTER V

BUDDHISM IN CHINA AND JAPAN—

(*b*) DARUMA AND THE MAHĀYĀNA CANON . 48

CHAPTER VI

PAGE

Buddhism in China and Japan—
(*c*) Tendai and Shinshu . . . 56

CHAPTER VII

Buddhism in China and Japan—
(*d*) Nichiren and the *Saddharma Pundarika* . 72

CHAPTER VIII

Christian Sermons from Buddhist Texts (1) . 88

CHAPTER IX

Christian Sermons from Buddhist Texts (2) . 96

CHAPTER X

Christian Sermons from Buddhist Texts (3) . 105

CHAPTER XI

How much did the Church Fathers know about the Mahāyāna? 115

CHAPTER XII

A School of the Prophets in Japan . . 132

Epilogue 146

INTRODUCTORY SONNETS

I

A LITTLE here, again a little there,
In varying measures, and in sundry ways,
For men of different ages, various climes,
God hath withdrawn the Veil that hides His Face,
Lest any man should say, "God grudged me Light,
And, grudging Light, denied the Hope of Life."
And we, with reverent minds searching the lore
Of ancient days, find buried here and there
Fragments of precious Truths, and piecing them
Again with reverent minds, construct a Form
And Body of the Truth,—when lo! the Whole
Grows to the Likeness of our own dear Christ.

II

Take these, O Christ! I would not give Thy Praise
To others, Sole True Lord of Life and Light:
For Thine the Vow, that camest sworn to do
Thy Father's Saving Will, Who loveth not
That sinners perish: Thine the Life of Toil,
The world's sharp enmity and bitter scorn,
And all the Passion, long drawn out, which closed
In the great pain of Thy most Holy Cross.
Perfect through Suffering, Thou didst gain for us
The rest of Paradise, where now, enthroned
As King, Thou reign'st in bliss, and whence Thou call'st
Poor men to come to Thee, to Whom is given
A Name above all Names, O truest Lord,
Of boundless Life and Love uncircumscribed.
Long years Thy Shadow, brooding o'er the East,
Hath told of Peace and Hope for sinful men:
Now turn the Shadow to Reality,
And bless us as we gather round Thy Feet,
O Amitābha-Christ, Sole Lord of All.

III

The Sower sowed, and sowing went His Way :
His seeds, sound grains of Truth, and on a soil
Rich with the mellowed Wisdom of the Age,
Promising noble yield of increment.
But Night came on,—the waning Aeon's Night,—
And while men slept an Envious Neighbour came,
Trod in the Sower's steps, and broadcast threw
Over the new-sown fields his evil Tares,
And so withdrew. And no one on the Farm
Perceived the Envious Neighbour's stealthy raid.

IV

"Stop rooting up those Tares," the Farmer said,
Seeing his hinds take hoe in hand to weed
The newly-sprouting ridges : "let them grow
Until the Harvest."
So the Wheat and Tares
Grew intertwined in all the Eastern fields.

But now the Seasons in their course have brought
The Harvest of the Age, the whitening Fields
Invite the sickle, and the Reapers go
To bind the golden sheaves. But, ere they bind,
Some humbly, rake in hand, must pull the Tares
Forth from the Wheat, and tie them up to burn ;
Since naught but Truth may garner in God's barn.

Such be my work in God's great Harvest-field.

V

WATER, so soft that it will take the shape
Of goblet, cup, or bowl, to suit the taste
Of every hand that pours it ; yet, withal,
Mighty to percolate the close-grained Rocks
That make the Framework of the Eternal Hills.[1]

And, though that Rock be Peter's, walled around
With concrete walls of anti-modernisms,
And grim, suspicion-barred, Encyclic gates,
Closed in the face of men that needs must think,
Yet shall our loving prayers contrive a way
By trickling paths to where, beneath the Rock,
Lies the deep pool of God's Eternal Love.

[1] The first part of this poem is a translation of a recent poem by His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, published at the beginning of this year.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

(Giving some account of the contents of my original book.)

Sakyamuni's date is given by Chinese writers, whom the majority of the Japanese follow, as 1027 B.C., nearly five centuries earlier than the date assigned to him by Western scholars who have worked on purely Indian materials. The difference may have come from a mistaken computation of semi-annual periods of rest, observed by Buddha and his followers (as though the times which they marked were years and not half years), or it may have been due to the worldly pride of Buddhist missionaries in China who wished to claim a priority for their faith as against Confucianists and Taoists. There can be little doubt that the Chinese date is wrong: we must place Shaka's birth about the middle of the sixth century B.C. and his death not before 480 B.C. We must make him the contemporary, not only of the earliest Hindoo philosophers, but also of the Hebrew prophets of the Captivity, and we may well suppose that during the forty-five years

of his ministry his teaching underwent very striking developments.

The distinction between the Mahāyāna and Hinayāna[1] began on the day that Shaka died. While the First Council was being held by the five hundred principal disciples in the Cave at Rajagriha, there was a caucus meeting of malcontents going on outside the closed gates. The Second Council, held some time later, produced an actual split, and the defeated party crossed over the borders of the Maghadan Kingdom into what is now the N.W. Provinces and the Punjaub. A large portion of these provinces had, even in Sakyamuni's lifetime, been incorporated into the Persian Empire, and it was there, under other skies, as it were, that the Pilgrim Fathers of the Mahāyāna sought room for the development of their religious thoughts.

This explains how it was that the Mahāyānists took no notice of the so-called Third Council, the one held at Patna in the reign of King As'oka, about 250 B.C. The malcontents who had sought refuge in the dominions of the Great King had shared the vicissitudes of the Persian Empire, and had become subjects of Alexander the Great and his successors. Indeed, at the very time when As'oka's Council was being held, the Buddhist portions of the Seleucid Empire, Parthia and

[1] For the benefit of readers unfamiliar with Buddhism, I will say that Hinayāna, or the Small Vehicle, is the Buddhism of Ceylon and the South, whilst the Mahāyāna, originating in Punjaub and Afghanistan, is now to be found in Nepaul, Thibet, Siberia, China, Korea, and Japan. It is also called Greater Vehicle Buddhism. Shaka is the Japanese for Sakyamuni.

Bactria, seem to have been in the throes of revolution, which would doubtless have made caution doubly necessary. As'oka had no jurisdiction over them, and could not summon them to his Council, and even had he summoned them, it would not have been wise or politic of them to attend. So As'oka's great Council was held without the Mahāyānists, and the two schools went each on its own way.

From the time of Alexander's conquest, N.W. India remained continuously under foreign influences. When Alexander's Empire was divided among his generals, it fell to the lot of the Seleucid Kingdom.[1] Bactria after a while set itself up as a Greek Kingdom, independent of Antioch, but only to give way to the Parthians, who, in their turn, had to cede the possession of the Indus lands to the restless Yuetchi. During the last three centuries before our era there was a difference in

[1] The following dates will be found useful :—

B.C. 256. Diodatus, revolting against the Seleucids, founds the Greek Kingdom of Bactria.

250. Parthia recovers her independence by a successful revolt.

244. Building of the Great Wall of China to keep out the restless Central Asian tribesmen.

196. Bactrian Kingdom seems to have been divided into two.

181-161. Bactrian Kingdom, united under Eucratides, extended as far as Hyderabad in Sind. This did not last long, for

175. There was an independent Greek-Indian State extending from Kabul to the Sutlej. This Kingdom lasted till A.D. 93.

174. Mithridates I., King of Parthia, conquers as far as the Hindoo Kush, thus destroying the Greek Kingdom of Bactria proper.

165. The Yuetchi, dislodged from their homes by the Hiungnu, seek a new home, which they find in Bactria proper.

the political circumstances of the two divisions of Buddhism, which served to accentuate their divergencies still further. Whilst the Indian Buddhists remained at home, confronted with purely Indian thoughts and beliefs, the extra-Indian, or Sakyan,[1] Mahāyānist rubbed up against Greek and Parthian (to say nothing of the half-Chinese peoples on the Western frontiers of the Celestial Empire) in a way that cannot have failed to modify his views in many respects.

It is to this period that I venture to assign the teachings embodied (I cannot say exactly when) in the Mahāyāna Scriptures of the so-called Hōdō and Hannya classes. Hōdō (Sanskrit *Vaipulya*) denotes "expansion," and Hannya (Skt. *Prajna*) is "wisdom." The Amida books of which I treated in the lectures delivered last year before the Asiatic Society of Japan,[2] belong to this expanded class, and the conclusion I draw from this fact is that the teaching of Amida, the germ of which belongs to the last years of Shaka's life, was in process of development during the last centuries before our era. The Buddha of the Western Buddha-field, of whom Shaka spoke to Queen Vaidehi, was gradually being developed in importance and coming to occupy the first place in the hearts of his believers. If, as I pointed out in my lectures, there is reason to believe that Shaka got his idea of the Buddha of Infinite Life and Light from the teachings of the contemporary

[1] *Sakyan*, a tribal name. The Historical Buddha belonged to the Sakyan tribe. The Sakyans were not confined to India. I speak of this subject again in a later chapter (Chap. VI.).

[2] These lectures are reproduced in Chapters IV. to VII. below.

prophets of the Exile, it is interesting also to note how in the Jewish mind the idea of the Fatherhood of the One God was being fostered and developed by post-Exilic Prophet and Psalmist.

Side by side with the pietistic tendencies of the *Hōdō*, we find, during this same period, the development of the *Prajna*, or "Wisdom" School. It is here that the Hellenistic influence is most conspicuous. I have an excellent little Japanese manual, *Buddha no Seikun*, which contains extracts from the Chinese Scriptures, translated into simple Japanese, and arranged under three heads: the first containing the *Agon*, or simple teachings of Sakyamuni's actual lifetime; the second the *Hōdō* and *Hannya* speculations, while the third is reserved for the still further developments of the so-called *Hoke* and *Nehan* teachings. It has been most interesting to me to find how close are the similarities between the *Hannya* books of the Chinese Scriptures and the "Sapiential Books" of the Old Testament on the one hand, and the later, mystic and semi-religious, philosophy of Greece on the other. Students of the classics will not need to be reminded that even Stoicism may be considered as a quasi-Oriental method of thought. I have no doubt that further research will enable us to find a good deal more that will throw light on the thought of this period. The notices of later Greek philosophy given by Christian Fathers, such as Origen, together with the Jewish Kabbala and similar collections, may be expected to yield some information.

Chinese history tells us that in 165 B.C. the

Hiun-gnu, the restless ancestors of the Huns, dislodged the Yuetchi Scythians from their homes in the west of China. The Yuetchi started for the West to find a new home, defeated the Parthians, overthrew the Greek Kingdom of Bactria, and established themselves on lands from which they had ousted the former proprietors. The Bactrian dominions extended as far as Hyderabad in the Sind Delta, and we may presume that the Yuetchi Scythians went at least as far as the Bactrians. A bad time followed for the Northern Buddhists (Japanese writers call it the era of the bad kings from the North); but persecutions changed to triumph when the greatest of the Yuetchi kings, Kanishka, became a convert to Buddhism after a period of religious hesitation and vacillation which may have been the cause of the sending of the Magi.[1] Kanishka's reign witnessed the summoning at Peshawar of another Council, as also the religious activities of As'vaghosha, said to be the Founder of the Mahāyāna properly so-called. As'vaghosha's date is given in *Bukkyō Kakuha Kōyō* as about A.D. 1, and some Japanese and Chinese writers affirm that the Buddha appeared again on earth during the lifetime of this

[1] Legge gives the date of Kanishka's accession as A.D. 10. His religious vacillations, whether feigned or real, are shown on his coins, which bear sometimes Hindoo and sometimes Zoroastrian symbols, but end with Buddhist ones. His conversion to Buddhism is said to have been due to an accidental meeting with an aged sage (ṛishi) who, supposing St. Luke's story to be historical, may very well have been one of the Wise Men. Immediately after his conversion Kanishka summoned a Council at which the Mahāyāna took its definite form by the composition of an Abhidharma or Commentary. After this Council Buddhism enters upon a new phase and becomes more and more theistic.

sage.[1] It is impossible for a Christian not to draw his own conclusions from this strange coincidence.

This crisis in the world's history seems to have brought with it a corresponding change in the theological aspects of Northern Buddhism. In the Hōdō-Hannya period of "expansion" there had been many gods and Buddhas (though even then there was a monotheistic tendency in the Pure Land teachings); in the *Hokke*[2] period which followed there was a tendency back again to simplicity by means of the absorption into one eternal Buddha of all the other Buddhas whom the fertile minds of the Hōdō period had invented. The Buddhist theology of the period invented, or borrowed, the word *mandala* to express the sum total of all that is divine in every part of the Universe, thus making individual deities and Buddhas only partial manifestations of the One Eternal Essence. The Buddhist *mandala* appears in Greek form in the Gnostic *pleroma*, which means the same thing. The *pleroma* of Valentinus the Gnostic is wonderfully similar to the *mandala* of the Shingon and Tendai

[1] This statement is, to my mind, one of the utmost importance. I have not got the original source from which it is taken. I have, however, a most useful Japanese publication entitled *Bukkyō Mondō Shū*, in which the editors undertake to answer questions propounded to them by believers. On p. 30, in reply to a question relating to the truth of this and other stories about As'vaghosha, the editor says that the story is quite a probable one. Many Buddhist priests whom I have questioned have doubted the truth of the legend; but they have all known of the story and have told me that it was well known.

[2] *Hokke* or *Hoke* is the Japanese name for *Saddharma Pundarika*. My reader will pardon me if I use the simpler and (to me) more familiar term instead of the Indian one, which is somewhat lengthy.

sects in Japan: and St. Paul himself has deigned to use the word to illustrate his own thought; for he has told us that in Christ dwells "the whole *pleroma* of God in a bodily form." I have spoken in my lectures of the *Hokekyō* which is the great Scripture of the last period of Mahāyāna development. I am sorry to think that a most valuable paper on the Mahāyāna writings by my friend Mr. Nukariya, of the Sōdō sect, has perished along with my own MS.[1] I had also made extracts from Irenaeus, Origen, and other Greek Fathers, showing conclusively (to my mind) that these writers were acquainted with these developments of Eastern thought. In my present book I speak of Epiphanius, Origen, and St. Augustine. It will be seen that the results are at least suggestive. And yet this valuable mine of information has only just been touched in a very perfunctory way.

From As'vaghosha, I went on to Nāgārjuna, the next Patriarch of the Mahāyāna. The remarkable thing about Nāgārjuna is that he is claimed as the originator of three different and distinct traditions of Japanese Buddhism. He was the author of a commentary on the *Hannya* books which marks the completion of that system; the Pure Land Priests speak of him as their first

[1] The same volume of the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* was to have contained an extremely painstaking paper by Professor Anesaki on a comparison of the Chinese Agama texts with the corresponding texts in Pali, and showing that the Chinese text, translated from a Sanskrit original now lost, often represents an earlier version than the Pali which is generally considered to be authoritative.

Patriarch, and, strangely enough, his authority is likewise claimed for the teachings of the Shingon sect, which is only very indirectly connected with Sakyamuni and his doctrines. For the Shingon was first taught by a Buddha of the name of Mahavairocana, to a monk named Vajrasattva, who delivered it to Nāgārjuna. It is not, technically speaking, Buddhism at all. I have tried in one of my lectures to show how closely it resembles Manichaeism. A new book, lately published in fairly easy Japanese (*Jusan butsu no yurai*), and giving an account of the thirteen Buddhas of Shingon, together with translations of the Scriptures on which the Shingon teachings are based, will, I hope, be found to throw much light on the matter. I will only say here that the secret name of God—*Abraxas*—is found both in Shingon and in the writings of the Alexandrine Basilides, and I think it will ultimately be found that Shingonism came either from Egypt or from Babylon. Everything, however, points to Egyptian Gnosticism, fertilised in the beginning by India, as the real parent of Shingon.

Here I stop my review of my burnt book, for though I spoke in it at some length of China and Japan, the rest does not concern my present purpose. Parts of it will be found in my lectures recently delivered, and reproduced later on in this book.

I have spoken of Christianity and Mahāyāna as two parallel faiths, originating in the same fruitful sixth century before Christ, with the Hebrew prophets of the Captivity, with the Indian

reformer in the valley of the Ganges. I have spoken of them again as each experiencing a new revival and expansion, at a period fraught with the greatest issues for the human race, the period when the Buddhist said that "the Buddha had appeared again in the lifetime of As'vaghosha," and the Christian turned to worship at the cradle in Bethlehem. I have shown Buddhism working its way through the Agnosticism of Sakyamuni, the Polytheism of the "Expansion," the Henotheism of the Amidaist, to the Mandala, the *pleroma*, which comprises in itself all things divine, and is called the Eternal, self-originated Buddha. I have shown Christ, in Whom the whole *pleroma* of the Godhead dwells in human form. It is hard to resist the conclusion that the two—the Eternal Sakyamuni and the Eternal Christ—are meant to represent the same person, and that the last phase of the Mahāyāna received its developing impulse from the manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles.

I would not wish it to be understood that I advocate a fusion of Christianity and the Mahāyāna into one. But I can see that, if what I have said be true, there may follow a gradual turning of Buddhism towards Christ in such a way that, without abating one jot of the great respect which all religious men should have for Sakyamuni, there shall be the further recognition of that higher reverence which we shall feel, and in conduct show, for Christ as the Fulfiller of all that Sakyamuni taught and revealed, and which rightly belongs to Him as the only being of whom it can be said that He was proved to be the Son of God

with power by the Resurrection from the dead. It is on the Resurrection that St. Paul always lays his special stress.

It is now twenty-four years since I first began my studies of Buddhism in Japan, studies which I have constantly pursued ever since, through evil report and through good, whenever I could snatch for them a few hours of labour in a life which has been neither free from cares nor free from work. During those long years, I have read every book I could come across that would help me in my subject. I have come across very few books written by clergymen or missionaries, and the majority of these have been by Germans and Frenchmen.

It is surely not right that these important researches should be left to the laity so entirely. Our duty as clergy is "rightly to divide the word of Truth," and how can we hope to divide it rightly without careful study of the conditions? St. Paul's power lay partly in his intimate acquaintance with the non-Christian systems around him, and our power lies very largely in our acquisition of a similar knowledge. To know thoroughly, better than the Japanese do themselves, the ins and outs of their religions, will give the missionary of Christ in this land the power and influence of a St. Paul.

I should desire nothing better than to see the missionary name cleared of the reproach (which is, on the whole, merited) of being indifferent to, and ignorant of, the religious conditions of the people amongst whom they work in the Name of Christ.

Ignorance can only lead to misrepresentation, and misrepresentation can only alienate men from Christ. It was not on such lines that the great Apologists and Writers of the first Christian Centuries carried on their work.

CHAPTER II

ON THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION

I. I BELIEVE in One God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

II. In one Lord, the Only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of His Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten not made, Being of one substance with the Father, by Whom all things were made.

III. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified.

Yet do I not believe in three Gods; for

IV. The Catholic Faith is that we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity. . . . The Father, Who is made of none: neither created nor begotten, . . . the Son, Who is of the Father alone; not made, nor created, but begotten; and the Holy Ghost, Who is of the Father and the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding. In this Trinity none is afore

or after other; none is greater or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together and co-equal, so that in all things, as is aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.

The above propositions are laid down by the Catholic Religion as "Universals of Faith." I find unconscious imperfect testimony to them all in the heathen and non-Christian religions with which I am acquainted—in the Amida of the Sukhāvati-Vyūhas, in the Eternal Sakyamuni of the *Saddharma Pundarika*, in the "Three Bodies of the Buddha." I find a similar correspondence in the teaching of the Confucianists that there are three Eternal Principles, *Teu*, *Ri*, *Ki*, Heavenly Will, Heavenly Reason, Heavenly Energy, and that these three are one.

V. This God—the Trinity in Unity—has not left Himself without witness.

He has revealed Himself, perfectly and completely, in Our Lord Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God (and therefore the Second Person of the above-mentioned Trinity), Who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down from Heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, Who suffered and was buried, Who rose again the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, from whence He shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead, Whose Kingdom shall have no end.

VI. But in addition to this, God has always and everywhere borne witness to Himself through the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life. This Holy Ghost is to be seen operating most clearly and distinctly amongst all those people who accept the Faith of the Trinity as stated above in the authorised words of the Catholic Church. He spake by the Prophets, not merely those of Israel, but those also among the Gentiles (such as Balaam and Melchizedek), who believed in Him. He is the Founder, Sustainer, and Life-giving principle of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, through whose legitimate organs He continually works for the edifying of the Body of Christ. It is He Who works in the Sacraments, beginning with the one Baptism for the Remission of Sins which is the entrance to the Church of God. And it is He Who keeps alive in us the hope of the Resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come. Amen.

All this I steadfastly believe, and it is to guard against a possible misunderstanding that I write it down here.

VII. It is an idea unworthy of the great love and wisdom of God to suppose that He has confined His revelation of Himself either to the people of the Jews in the days before Christ, or to the people called Christian in the days since. God has never left Himself without witness; and to every nation has He given something at least of the Divine Truth.

To some more has been given, to others less; and the truths thus given have often been mixed

with error and superstition and sometimes changed beyond all recognition. To some individuals, too, much has been given, and in abundant measure; and these men have stood out amidst their fellows as the great religious teachers of the non-Christian world. There have been many such men; may we not say of them that the Lord and Giver of Life has breathed upon them too?

I will instance two with whose teachings my own life has brought me into contact: Confucius, the Sage of China, and Sakyamuni, the Saint of India, of whom it is alleged that he was born of a Virgin, but of whom none has ever said that he died for the sins of man and was declared to be the Son of God by the Resurrection from the dead.

Through these men God the Holy Spirit spoke to their countrymen and contemporaries quite as clearly as He did to the Jews through the prophets of Israel. Not everything that they said was thus inspired, and the blind devotion of after ages has enveloped their teachings in a mass of extraneous matter which comes neither from them, nor yet from the Holy Spirit of God.

Still there are precious gems of truth, which are all needed for the Crown of Him Whom we worship as the Son of God, Whose kingdom shall have no end either in time or in space, or in height, breadth, or depth of Truth, to Whom belong the glory and wealth of all nations.

VIII. It is the duty of the student of Comparative Religion to search for these gems, to separate from the teachings of these great non-Christian Saints all that is spurious accretion only

fit to be cast away and burned, all that is local and temporary and that will pass away, and to find and gather that precious residuum of Universal Faith which is true for all time and for all men. This can be done by diligent and careful comparison of system with system, and a careful assortment of all that is common to them all, or to the greater part of them. If Christ, Moses, Confucius, Sakyamuni, Mahomet should have agreed in enunciating a truth, and if that truth should have been unanimously accepted by the peoples amongst whom these religious teachers hold spiritual sway, there would be a strong presumption in favour of considering such a truth to be one of the Universals of Religion. A remarkable thing about Christ is that practically all that He said is a "Universal" of this kind.

IX. It is only in our age that such a wide range of religious comparison has become possible. It is possible in our age, because the Divine Providence has of late been bringing to light the hidden facts of history and science in a most remarkable manner, and it is the high privilege of the student of Comparative Religion to be able to assist in this work of the Divine Providence which is pre-eminently calculated to prepare the world for that Great Judgment to which we all look forward. It should solemnise us all to think that, in this way, we, students of a new science, are in a very real fashion fellow-workers with God.

X. It is not the duty of the individual student to form a new religion or establish a new sect. What he does is to gather facts and to sort them

out as best he can. The results of his work he submits to the judgment of those who have (or claim to have) authority over the consciences of men as the authorised representatives of the Lord and Giver of Life; in the ultimate resort these results will be referred to the Judgment of Him to Whose appearance as a Judge we Christians look forward with reverent joy.

CHAPTER III

THE REJECTED STONE

[This paper was written some time ago, not for publication, but for private circulation in MS. form amongst interested friends. I have given it a place in this volume as having some relation to the main subject of my work.]

I. *The Shaking.*—The sixth century before Christ was a most momentous one in the religious history of the world. In that century Judaism began its existence as a separate religion (and by Judaism I mean, not so much the teachings of Moses, as the reformed faith of the Jews after their return from the Captivity), a religion which owed its first inception to the labours of Ezra, which was influenced in many directions by the Persianising Pharisees on the one hand, and the philosophising Sadducees on the other, but which found its truest expression in the spiritual teachings of the prophets, and the pure lives of their humble followers, the "meek" and the "pure-hearted," who "looked for redemption in Israel" and welcomed Christ when He came.

The same age witnessed the birth of Pythagoras, the Father of Greek philosophy; of Confucius, who,

more than any other man, has moulded the best thought of China ; of Gotama, who reformed the religious life of India ; of Zoroaster, the Sage of Persia. These are all great men whom the world has acclaimed as its teachers, and all, with the possible exception of Pythagoras, are among the great-world forces of to-day. That they should all have appeared almost simultaneously on the world's stage is a significant fact. The significance will perhaps become more apparent to the Japanese reader if I call his attention to the fact that, if the legendary history of his country is trustworthy, the same sixth century before Christ witnessed the migration from some part of the Asiatic Continent of the conquering race which subdued the islands that now form the Empire of Japan.

The age of which I speak has been described as the period of "the shaking of the nations." It was truly an upheaval, and one of the results of that movement was the formation of the Japanese Empire.

II. "*In many fragments and in many ways.*"—The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the knowledge of God having been communicated "unto the fathers in many fragments and in many ways" (Heb. i. 1). If that was true of the Jews whom the author had in his mind when writing, how much more true is it of the religious experiences of the other nations, amongst whom, assuredly, God has not left Himself without a witness!

No system without some grain of truth, and no system (until that which is Perfect should come) containing the whole truth. Some systems more full of truth than others, others in which the truth-germs lie buried under the accretions of superstition, worldliness, and error.

Here a little, and there a little, during the centuries which succeeded the "shaking," were the Universal Truths of religion made known to mankind; but so clearly and distinctly that we are astonished to find how much a Plato, an Aristotle, a Cicero, knew about the basal fundaments of religion. Confucius and Mencius are master-minds of practical life-philosophy, and it is not too much to say that millions in India and Central Asia have found Gotama to be for them the "Way, the Truth, and the Life."

But with all the systems that arose out of the "shaking" of the sixth century B.C. there was a sub-consciousness that the Truth, imperfectly apprehended, had been given them "in many fragments and in many ways." There was a something in men's minds for which they still hoped: it was called, by one of the prophets, "the desire of all nations," and it was a desire almost universally felt.

The Jew looked forward to the coming of the Messiah; the Persian, not content with Mithras, sent Magi to hunt for His birth; the Hindoo conceived longings which incorporated themselves in Krishna and Rama; the Confucian Emperor of China sent messengers Eastward to find the great Buddha that had been born, and

the answer of Buddhism lay in changing the title of the Master from the *Tathāgata*, "thus gone," to the "*Nyorai*," the "One thus come (as we expected him)," and in declaring that Gotama had appeared again on earth in the days of As'vaghosha the Saint. Now As'vaghosha was the contemporary of the Lord Christ.

III. *The Unifying Factor.*—There have been many lords and many gods, says St. Paul, speaking of the time when religious Truth was given to the nations in many fragments and in many ways, but to us there is but One God, the Father, and One Lord, the Man Christ Jesus. St. Paul conceived of Christ as the Unifying Factor, which brought together into One all the fragments of Truth that had been in the world during the marvellous five centuries of preparation.

It is the fashion now, amongst the more advanced sort of rationalising critics, to cast a slur of doubt on the veracity of the accounts of Christ as given in the Four Gospels, and I have heard even a missionary (who surely ought to have known better) declare that there was no trustworthy material in existence out of which to construct a biography of Jesus of Nazareth. I do not believe the charge. I am convinced in my own mind that the Story of the Gospels is a story which contains the Life of a Man who really lived His life just as it is there described. It is true that there are many things in that life which are apparently echoes and repetitions of things said and done in the lives of the great men who

preceded the carpenter's son at Nazareth as teachers in their own spheres and generations. It is true that many of the sayings put into the mouth of the Master by the Evangelists are to be found in the writings of Greek philosophers and Chinese sages. It is true, to take the most striking of all instances, that the Life of Sakyamuni presents us with most striking resemblances to the Life of Christ, that he was born of a Virgin Mother, that his birth was celebrated by the songs of celestial beings, that he was tempted by the Evil One and transfigured. There is no need to suppose that the one is a copy of the other, nor that the one set of stories is a fraudulent or diabolical forgery, nor yet that both sets are the clumsy inventions of the subsequent ages of darkness.

During the five centuries immediately before the Christian Era, God's Truth was being gradually revealed, "here a little and there a little," "in many fragments and in many ways," as nations and peoples were able to bear the light. Christ took to Himself, and combined in His own person, all that had hitherto been revealed and known. The unifying factor was not the Incarnation nor the Virgin Birth, nor the Life of Benevolence, nor the Words of Wisdom and Love. All these were to be found in Hindooism, in Buddhism, in Confucianism, in Greek philosophy. But when the Incarnate Son of God, born of Mary, baptized in Jordan, and tempted of Satan, after a life spent in works of mercy and words of love, faced death rather than be untrue to principle, and not only faced death but conquered it by Resurrection and

Ascension, it was known at once that He had gathered all things into Himself, and that there was no further need of any partial or fragment-wise Gospel.

And supposing that the whole story of Christ were a fraud and a forgery, that the Evangelists were not historians but only novelists. What then?

If it could be demonstrated that Christ had never lived, the same process of reasoning that should destroy Christ would also destroy Sakya-muni, Socrates and Confucius, and the world would find itself deprived of all its religious teachers. For if Christ is not historically demonstrable, then no man is, and if I am forced to believe in the historical existence of Julius Caesar on the evidence of a few books and monuments, I must also accept that of Jesus Christ, on evidence the same in kind but far greater in volume.

But, even supposing that the historical Christ went, the ideal Christ subjectively apprehended would still remain. I should still say to myself that there is a world of ideas as well as a world of material facts, that the idea, though immaterial, is still truly existent. And I should still say of Christ that He was the Ideal of what the Saviour and Teacher of Mankind should be, that He was no local conception, but one of Universal Adaptation, as summing up all religious truth in Himself. And that ideal Christ, painted for me by those consummate artists the Evangelists, I should still cling to as being, to me at least, the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

It is this that, to my mind, constitutes the Strength of Christ. He is both ideal and actual. He is the "ideal, esoteric Saviour" of whom the Theosophists speak, but He is also the actual historical Saviour Whom Christians worship. He is, in the innermost circle of abstract existence, the eternal Idea of the Redeeming God: in the material sphere in which we live, He is the Incarnation of that Idea in its Fulness. And He has been declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection from the dead.

IV. *The Stone which the Builders rejected.*—And yet, when the Resurrection and Ascension had been accomplished, St. Peter spoke of Christ as the Stone rejected by the builders. The image was one which had been used by Christ Himself, and was taken from one of the Psalms which Christ so constantly used as His manuals of devotion.

The fact of the rejection was plain enough. Ever since the return from Babylon there had been among the Jews a constantly growing hostility between the men of the world, the scheming and political priests and statesmen, and the blind teachers of the blind on the one hand, and the godly souls, the meek upon earth, the thirsters after righteousness, the lovers of peace, upon the other. And when Christ came, the Perfection and Crown of the lowly of heart, the conflict had come to a crisis, and the stone which the prophets had prepared as their contribution to the Spiritual Building of God's Temple,

the stone of which Christ was the visible type and embodiment, was rejected by the priestly builders and political architects.

Pontius Pilate, Herod, and the chief priests were not the only people who rejected that stone. History tells us of how the early Roman Empire rejected it, and every reader of European history knows how the priests and statesmen of Imperial Rome, whilst welcoming into their Pantheon all kinds and manners of gods, yet refused admission to Christ, Whose faith was never tolerated even by wise and prudent Emperors.

Again, other builders rejected the Stone.

The Parthians sent Magi to look at it; but we never read of Parthia having adopted the Christian Faith, though in later ages Nestorian Christians were encouraged for political reasons. It is tolerably clear that Bartholomew and Thomas preached in India and its frontier lands, but neither Buddhist nor Brahman wanted that Stone for their spiritual buildings; for near though the Mahāyānist conception of Sakyamuni is to the Christian conception of Christ, the Cross has always been the marking line between the Incomplete and the Perfect.

Chinese builders, too, rejected the Stone as unworthy of a place in their spiritual edifice. During five centuries or more, beginning with A.D. 150 when the "importation of books" commenced, religious writings poured into China, and the Chinese showed the most marvellous toleration of the most incompatible tenets of religion. And yet, when the "harmonists"

began their work in the fifth century A.D. of constructing an eclectic system of religion for the Celestial Empire, the Emperors of the Tang dynasty, who were the master-builders in the undertaking, whilst freely allowing the "harmonising" Buddhist priests to adopt what they thought good from Confucianist, Buddhist, Taoist, Hindoo, Parsee, or Manichaean sources (for all these teachings had been imported into the country), distinctly and clearly forbade them to incorporate any Christian elements into their teaching. They tolerated Christianity in their midst: but they refused to use it for building up their spiritual edifice. Thus Christ became the Stone rejected by China.

Similarly, it was rejected by Japan. When the two priests Kōbō and Dengyō were sent to China in the year A.D. 804 as Government students, charged with the task of building up for Japan a spiritual edifice of religious belief, Nestorian Christians were actively at work in the capital city of the Chinese Empire, and there is still in existence the stone pillar which the Nestorian Bishop Olopen caused to be engraved with a statement of the Christian Faith and to be set up in Singanfū some twenty-five years before the visit of the Japanese priests.[1] In framing the system of the Japanese Mahāyāna, Kōbō and

[1] In the *Chinese Recorder* for March 1908, the Rev. W. S. Pakenham-Walsh has a most interesting article on Nestorianism in China, which is extremely useful and deserves a wide circulation. According to this paper the date of the celebrated Singanfū monument is A.D. 780, just twenty-three years before the arrival of the Japanese students of religion.

Dengyō freely adopted fragments of Confucian ethics, Taoist, mysticism, Shinto nature-worship, to amalgamate into one system with Indian and Central Asian Buddhism. But they had no eyes for the Singanfū monument, and when they came back to Japan they breathed no word of Christ.[1] In Japan also the Stone was rejected, and there was another and better known, if not more serious, rejection in the seventeenth century, when the Roman Catholics were banished and the Christian Faith cruelly proscribed.

In the meantime (I say it with gentleness, for it is not good to criticise one's own spiritual household) it would seem as though even Christian builders had sometimes rejected the Stone, not in theory but in practice. For there is this difference between the Christian rejection of Christ and His rejection by non-Christian peoples: the latter reject Him on principle, because they conceive of Him as alien to their creed and system; the former reject Him because they are untrue to professed principles. In the one case we have to demonstrate that Christ is really the completion of every non-Christian faith that has in it any of the elements of Universality; in the other, we have to call men back to first principles, and to remind them of what it really means to base one's Faith and Hope in Christ.

[1] I have it on good authority that some of the great Buddhist libraries in Kyoto contain ample testimony to the fact that Christianity was known in Japan long before the arrival of the Jesuits. This knowledge would reach Japan not only through the Nestorians (there was one Nestorian physician in Japan, at Nara, in the eighth century), but also through the Mongolians, many of whose Central Asian allies were Nestorian Christians.

V. *Ways of Rejection.*—I have said that Christ, the Stone rejected by the builders, must be looked at in two ways,—as the historical Jesus Who lived in Palestine at a certain definite period of the world's history, and as the Eternal Christ, the Ideal of the Perfect Man, the Light that lighted every man, Whose day Abraham rejoiced to see.

There are therefore two ways of "rejecting the Stone." It may be a rejection of the historical Christ, or it may be a rejection of the "Christos Light" as it has been called. The Jews rejected both the historical personage Who came amongst them and the Eternal Light of which He was the embodiment. When Rome and China rejected Christ, it was the historical personage Whom they rejected, but we cannot read the history of those nations nor read our own intercourse with pious persons outside of the Christian pale without a conviction that, while the historical personage has been thus rejected, there has yet often been an acceptance, as far as has been possible, of the Eternal Light of the Soul. A feeling of loyalty to the claims of Sakyamuni or Confucius may dispose a man to discard the claims of the historical Jesus, just as a mistaken trend of scholarship may make another doubt the authenticity of the Gospel Story. And yet such a man may be far from rejecting that Ideal of Perfect Manhood in union with God which Christ sets before him, which indeed Christ, viewed as St. Paul viewed Him, actually is. He is guilty in such a case of the "minor rejection," and is liable only to that minor excommunication which shuts Him out from the external fellowship of Christian people.

I have called it a "minor" rejection. There is another form of rejection, the rejection of Christ by those who accept Him as a historical Being, and are so far orthodox and sound, but who, whilst reciting the formula of belief, are consciously or unconsciously pushing away from them all desire or acceptance of the Ideal Christ placed in their hearts by the Holy Spirit. This is indeed the sin against the Holy Spirit, the orthodox acceptance of the Historical Person by people who are living in defiance of the Ideal Conception of the Perfect Man. It involves what I may call the "major excommunication." The man who sins against the light of Conscience, against the Christ that is in Him, loses the sense and comfort of the Invisible Presence. Christians and Buddhists alike will know what I mean by that.

It follows from what I have said that Christ has many followers who are outside the Christian community. Christ illustrated this truth by a parable in which He spoke of two sons, the one of whom promised to obey his Father and work in the vineyard, while the other refused to make any such promise. But the one that promised to go stayed away, and the one that refused repented and went.

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in Heaven."

VI. *The Will of the Father.*—We must not speak or think of the Will of the Father as something arbitrary and changeable, as though God were

some fanciful old man, full of whims and wishes. The Will of the Father is limited by God's own Nature, which never changes. It is the same "yesterday, to-day, and for ever." It is precisely what the Buddhist speaks of when he talks of the Law, though the Buddhist looks only at the Law, and not through the Law at the Unknown Law-giver behind it.

Broadly speaking, however, the Will of the Father is identical with "Law," and it is the permanent regulating and informing Power which affects and permeates every department of the Universe.

Every man has some knowledge of this Law. In some men this knowledge is very deep and wide, so that they speak as the "oracles of God," and their fellow-men, listening to them, say, according to the Japanese proverb, that though Heaven has no mouth it uses the tongues of men. Such men are Confucius, Socrates, Sakyamuni, and every real Christian reveres them all. Only he says that the Man who had the deepest knowledge of any was the Man Christ Jesus, Whose claims to be heard result from that Universality of Spiritual Wisdom which is, in itself, one of the proofs of His Divinity.

To the Christian, therefore, the Will of the Father becomes the Law of Christ, and if you ask me what the Law is, I will answer in the words of St. Paul: "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the Law of Christ."

"Bear ye one another's burdens." The Buddhist is quite right when he speaks of the world

as one vast web or net in which nothing lives of itself, or by itself, or for itself, but all things are closely knit together and interdependent the one on the other. Sin, says the late Mr. Kyōzawa,[1] in his excellent little treatise "*Shūyōjikan*," is nothing else but a failure to realise this essential Oneness. This failure may be due to ignorance; it may also come from a wilful opposition to the laws of the Universe which are the Laws of Christ. But the result is always the same; every attempt to set up self as something higher than or independent of the rest of the world is a breach of the Law of Christ. It is only by realising our Oneness with the rest of the living and sentient Universe that we can properly fulfil the Law of Christ, of bearing one another's burdens. This is a theme that is capable of infinite expansion.

VII. *The Burden-bearer.*—This is, I believe, the title of a Buddhist Sutra which has recently been unearthed and published in the Transactions of a learned Society. It might easily be a title of Christ, of Whom it has been said that He bore our sins, our infirmities, our sorrows even, and our sicknesses, so that Christians, who believe in prayer, are encouraged to add to His burdens by "casting all their cares upon Him."

But it is not thus that I would look upon my theme. Rather let us look upon ourselves as the burden-bearers, as fulfilling the Law of Christ and

[1] *Kyōzawa* was a much-esteemed Buddhist priest of the Shinshu sect. He died some twelve years ago, and his memory is still much revered by a small body of enthusiastic admirers.

of "all the Buddhas" by carrying one another's loads of life.

Burden-bearers are the salt of the earth, the saving ingredient which preserves society from decay. Because of their presence in the world, human life is the happy thing that it is, and all the misery of social life comes from the scarcity of them in certain spheres or localities. Burden-bearers are to be found in every country and nation, and there is no religion that can claim a monopoly of them. If there were more of them the world would be still better than it is; if we were all burden-bearers the world would be perfect.

Burden-bearing is a very quiet occupation. There is no fuss, or noise, or trumpet-blowing about it. The burden-bearer begins by bearing his own burden to the best of his ability, and by that very act finds himself bearing the burdens of others, of his wife and children, of his employers, of his aged parents. He does not go far in search of burdens to bear. They come to him in the course of daily life; he takes them up as he finds them, and never refuses a load that comes to him in this way. Thus, where burden-bearers abound, no burden is carried on a single pair of shoulders. The load of the world's care is made lighter, and the result is the increase of joy.

If all men were burden-bearers, and took a delight in their occupation, their only concern would be how best to bear their burdens. And if all men were so engaged, there would be no need of religious proselytism. All men would be of one

religion, for they would all be engaged in fulfilling the Law of Christ, and that in spite of differences in religious belief and worship. I have often wondered whether this be not the meaning of the prophecy of Micah with which I shall close this paragraph:—"They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. But they shall sit *every man under his vine and under his fig-tree*, and none shall make them afraid. . . . For all the peoples will walk *every one in the name of his god*: but we will walk in the Name of the Lord our God for ever and ever."

VIII. *The Headstone of the Corner.*—"Every man under his vine and under his fig-tree, and none to make them afraid." The picture is one of the most complete and universal toleration of religion—a toleration such as the world has perhaps never realised, and of which it is only now beginning to see the first foreshadowings.

We have it here in Japan. It is no vain boast to say that here there is the utmost toleration. Buddhists, Confucianists, Shintoists, Christians, Catholic, Orthodox, Protestants—all free to live and to work side by side, with none to hinder or let them in their religion and worship. It is an ideal picture—almost too ideal for some minds which would fain see limitations placed on human liberty. But to me it is ideal, and for this reason: it is so very complete. The religious liberty of Japan is greater than that enjoyed either in

England or America, for there are fewer social bars, and less tyranny of public opinion to circumscribe the freedom of a man's religious liberty.

And for this very reason I look forward with hope. I see the stones being brought for the Temple, hewn from many quarries, Confucianist, Shinto, Buddhist, Christian, all properly shaped by the chisel of God's good Providence. I see the stones placed in their proper positions, in tiers and rows, the walls rising, and the dome approaching its completion. It is not very strong just yet, for the walls, which are intended to rise up into an arch, converge together, and are all a little out of the perpendicular (are we not all aware of shortcomings, personal, social, political?) and there is just a fear of things tottering to their fall.

But now the building is so near its completion that but one stone remains to be fixed in its place. It is the Christ, Historical and Ideal, Human and Divine, Material and Transcendental. It has been rejected once and again—providentially, we may suppose—until all the other stones had been fitted into their places. But now, in era of peace and toleration, when men can sit under their vines and fig-trees, with no one to make them afraid, the religious world can make a quiet and dispassionate survey of the whole edifice of religious thought. And in that quiet survey it becomes evident that the contributions have mostly been good, that Greece and Rome, India, China, Japan, have each given something that is worth having and cherishing, but that the Crown and Completion of all is Christ, the Historical and Ideal, Whom

the earlier religious builders set at nought and threw aside. And so it comes to be true in the last days that "the Stone which the builders rejected has become the Headstone of the Corner."

And whenever, in God's good Providence, burden-bearing shall have become the Universal Rule, so that all men of all religions shall be engaged, consciously or unconsciously, in this fulfilment of the Law of Christ, then shall we see that happy era of toleration which the prophet saw in spiritual vision. Then, when the gales of controversy are past, when the tares growing side by side with the wheat shall have reached their full perfection, it will be seen that much that we took for tares has really turned out to be wheat, and we shall be glad that the non-Christian faith, the heretical teaching, was suffered to grow up side by side with our own. Then too, in that calmer atmosphere, we shall see what is already beginning to make its appearance here in the calm atmosphere of Japan, the gradual conversion of heathenism by the adoption of Christian ideals instead of heathen ones, to be followed by the gradual absorption of paganism into the Church. Already we see around us the gradual obliteration of Christian denominational barriers, and the disappearance of sects and divisions. When this has been accomplished there will come the disappearance of different religions and conflicting creeds. There will be left but one religion—"the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea." The Rejected Stone will in truth be the Chief Stone of the Corner.

CHAPTER IV

BUDDHISM IN CHINA AND JAPAN

(*a*) *Kōbō Daishi and his Indebtedness to Manichaeism*

[I am enabled to reproduce this and the following chapters through the kindness of the Council of the Asiatic Society of Japan.]

In the first century A.D. commences the first Buddhist Evangelisation of China.[1] The first mission, undertaken in consequence of a vision, was a comparative failure. Only two men went, and they died within four years after their arrival.

Eighty years later, A.D. 148, we get the true Buddhist propaganda in China, headed by a Prince of Parthia, who had resigned his throne in order to become a monk, the son of a famous king who had been the enemy of Trajan and the ally of Hadrian, to whom he owed his restoration, and

[1] This must be taken as meaning the first official introduction. Some Chinese authorities say that Sakyamuni himself preached in China. There is a tradition that a Buddhist priest with books and images reached China in 217 B.C., and it is certain that during the last two centuries B.C. Buddhism had gained a strong hold on the Asiatic tribes sometimes described as the "Western frontagers of China."

whose sister, taken prisoner by the former, had been set free by the latter of these two Emperors, after several years of captivity in Rome.[1] Christianity had long ere this taken firm root in Persia, and in Central Asia around Balkh and Merv. It is a noteworthy fact that of the early Buddhist missionaries to China nearly all came, not from India, but from Central Asia, from Parthia, Afghanistan, Bokhara, Samarcand, and that India proper took no share in the work until much later. The Indian Buddhists at this time were far too busy fighting their religious and political enemies the Brahmans, to have any time to attend to foreign missions, and they were only too glad to avail themselves of any help that came to them from their brethren in Central Asia. It is to these missionaries from Central Asia that China owed the first translations of the books which speak of the Great Vow of Amida.

The history of Chinese Buddhism is mainly one of books and translations. My work here has lain chiefly in analysing the results attained by Dr. Nanjo in his painstaking Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka, and in studying the routes leading into China from the West, together with the political changes in the Celestial Empire which necessitated the transference of the capital from one locality to

[1] The Prince of Parthia is *Anshikâo*, of whom I speak again in a later chapter. It seems almost certain that he was the son of Chosroes, though I cannot at the present moment lay my hand on all the data necessary for establishing this point. If what I have concluded is true, we have here a most interesting side light on the controversy between Hippolytus and Callistus. See below, Chapter XI.

another. I have also tried to gain some idea of the various religions already existing in China—as also of those which, like Buddhism, came into the country from the West—notably Zoroastrianism, Manichaeism, and Nestorian Christianity.

I have also given much thought to Chisha Daishi's brave attempt to harmonise the miscellaneous jumble of 6000 books which constitute the Northern Buddhist Canon, and by this road have been brought to *Singanfū*, the Capital of China at the beginning of the ninth century, when Dengyō Daishi [1] and Kōbō [2] were sent over from Japan as Government students of religion. They found in Singanfū, Buddhism supreme, with Confucianism and Taoism, sometimes as enemies, sometimes as friends. The Manichaeans had at least one large Church in the city ; the Nestorians had four, and when Kōbō and Dengyō visited the city they must

[1] *Dengyō Daishi*, known during his lifetime as Saichō, was born in A.D. 767, and entered the Buddhist priesthood in 779. He was sent to China as a Government student of religion in 802, and spent three years in studying, mostly at the celebrated Temple on Mount *Tendai*, in Chekiang. On his return he founded a sect known as *Hokke-Tendai*, based on the system he learned in China, with the *Hokke* or *Saddharma Pundarika* as its principal holy book. This sect is now generally known simply as Tendai. He also brought back with him the ceremony of Baptism (*Kwanchō*), which is very similar to the baptism described by Origen in his description of the Callistian heresy. See *infra*, Chap. XI.

[2] *Kōbō Daishi* (A.D. 774-835) was sent to China in 804, and studied the system known as Yogachara or Mantra (Jap. *Shingon*). Legends about him are very numerous ; amongst other things, he is said to have been the inventor of the Japanese syllabary.

It must not be supposed that these two men were the first preachers of Buddhism in Japan. The Faith had been in the country for some centuries, but as an Indian exotic. What Kōbō and Dengyō did was to give it a Japanese dress and fit it to the peculiar genius-disposition of the people.

have seen standing at a street corner the celebrated Singanfū monument which proclaimed to all China the great doctrines of the Christian Faith.

Kōbō's faith—the so-called Mantra or Shingon Buddhism—so much resembles Manichaeism that it may be said to be practically the same system. It has many Indian elements in it, but also some that are Egyptian and Gnostic. To Christians it is interesting, because St. Augustine was for many years a Manichaean before becoming a Christian, and because many of the points which St. Augustine tells us about the Manichaeans are to be found in the Shingon Buddhism of to-day.

I. On the 20th April A.D. 242, Sapor I., King of Persia, was crowned at Persepolis. He was the second king of the Sassanian House, and his coronation implied the firm establishment of a national Government for Persia. In the midst of the rejoicings a young man stepped forward announcing himself a Prophet. "What Zoroaster was to Persia," he said, "what Buddha to India, what Christ in the West, that am I to Babylonia." The faith that he proclaimed was to be a revival of the old faith of Babylon, in which he saw the materials for a world-wide all-embracing religion, and to which he added certain elements drawn from India and Egypt.

II. Cubricus (the young man's real name) was born of a noble but poor family in Babylonia. His father was a very religious man and a leading light among the Mugtasilahs, a half-Christian, half-pagan sect, amongst whom he learned a great deal both about Christianity and about the old faith of the Babylonians. The Persians, who ruled the

country, were Zoroastrian fire-worshippers, but extremely tolerant, and there were many Jewish colonies in Babylon. Evidently he was accustomed to a jumble of religious notions.

Adopted by a widow woman, whose wealth was put at his disposal, he found amongst her books some evidently Buddhist works which attracted his attention. Only the names of these books have been preserved—the *Gospel*—the *Chapters*—the *Mysteries* and the *Treasure*—but they were evidently Buddhist from the fact that they were originally written by a man named Scythianus (*Scythian = Sakyan; cf.* Sakyamuni), and enlarged or re-edited by his disciple Terebinthus, who afterwards assumed the title of Buddha.

Cubricus then went on his travels, to the confines of India and China, *i.e.* the country north of Afghanistan, Turkestan, or Bactria. Here he lived in a cave—the whole country is filled with ancient Buddhist rock-monasteries—and acquired fame as a painter—the rock caves are full of mural decorations. When he came back he had assumed the name of *Mani*, the artist or painter, with an alternative *Manichaeus*, which may possibly be connected with the famous Indian monastery of *Manikyala*.

When Mani appeared at the coronation of Sapor and formulated his doctrine, he was first welcomed, then (possibly for political purposes) banished. Sapor's successor, Hormisdas I., recalled him and showed him much favour. But the next king was his enemy. He was arrested and put to death. He was flayed while still

living, and his skin, stuffed with straw, was hung up *in terrorem* over the gates of Persepolis.

III. After his death his religion spread with great rapidity, adapting itself, wherever it went, to the religion of the country. We find Manichaeans in Syria, Palestine, Asia Minor, Egypt (Manes, speaking to Christians, calls himself the Apostle of Christ, or the Paraclete), in North Africa (St. Augustine), in France and Spain. It is mentioned as a great honour to Ireland that there were no Manichaeans there, and among the tenets and practices for which the Knights Templars were suppressed were some that were Manichaean.

Again, there were Manichaeans in Ceylon, in South India (there was a Manichaean St. Thomas, and the shrine near Madras is said to be Manichaean), in Thibet (relics), and very numerous communities in Turkestan, Balkh, Kashgaria, Samarcand. They were in China in A.D. 500 if not earlier, with large temples at Singanfū and other places, and it is said of them that their priests (Saba) passed themselves off as Buddhists, and adopted Buddhist terminology and discipline.

IV. In A.D. 805 and 806 there arrived at Singanfū two Japanese priests, sent by Government to study religious conditions and report. The Indian Buddhism till that time in Japan was not altogether satisfactory, and the Government wanted something better adapted to existing conditions.

They had an abundant choice of material.

Confucianism, Taoism, Nestorian Christianity (the celebrated Singanfū table), Manichaeism, and Buddhism of many sorts—Small Vehicle and Large, Indian and Chinese.

Dengyō Daishi, the first of these young men, adopted the Buddhism lately formulated in China by Chisha Daishi, better known as Tendai Daishi. It was an eclectic system, containing elements taken from many sources, Manichaean among the rest, and is perhaps the most widely-embracing of all sects of Buddhism.

Kōbō Daishi's sect is known in Japan as Shingon (Mantra), in India as Yogachara. It does not claim to be based at all on the teachings of Sakyamuni. "Sakyamuni's faith," said a Shingon believer the other day, "is a very imperfect doctrine, good enough for the ignorant and imperfect. We speak wisdom amongst the Perfect —and the wisdom which we have did not come from Sakyamuni, but from a Greater Buddha *Vairocana* (in Jap. Dainichi) who revealed it to men." I hope to be able to show that this Shingon teaching is simply Manichaeism. I know that it is generally looked upon as being essentially Hindoo, —a mere adaptation of mystic Hindooism to the tenets of Buddhism. But there are some striking differences between the Hindoo *yoga* and the Shingon *yogachara*, and those differences are just what we should expect from a Manichaean adapter. Have we not already seen that in speaking to Christians Manes spoke of himself as the Comforter, that his disciples in China ranked themselves as Buddhist? We should naturally

expect him to the Hindoos to be as a Hindoo that he might gain the Hindoos.

V. The Shingon believers claim that their doctrines came from South India, where Nagarjima found their Sacred Books in an Iron Tower, when he received Baptism from an old saint. The claim is not generally admitted, but the rejection of the claim is not now made in terms so curt and summary as were Nichiren's remarks three centuries later, when he characterised Kōbō Daishi as "Japan's prize liar" (*Nihon no dai mōgo*).

As a matter of fact, both Manichaeism and the earlier Zoroastrianism on which it was partly based were firmly established in Southern India, and there is a great deal in common in the terminology and ritual of Hindooism and of Zoroastrianism, so that it would not be anything very strange to find both Zoroastrian and Hindoo words in Shingon.

VI. When a Manichaean became a Christian he was required to make the following abjuration: "I anathematise . . . Terebinthus who is called Buddha . . . Zoroaster, whom Manes called a god who had, so he said, appeared in former times to the Indians and Persians (possibly this is the explanation of the Iron Tower), and whom he named the Sun (Jap. Dainichi). . . . I anathematise all the gods whom Manes has invented . . . the four-faced Father of Greatness (the eternal Buddha of Shingonism is 'four-faced,' having four essential qualities) . . . the so-called Male Virgin of light (possibly Kwannon, the bisexual deity of Japan) . . . the five spiritual Lights (*τὰ πέντε*

φέγγη) . . . the Five Dhyani Buddhas of Shingon . . . the five spiritual emanations from the Manichaean God, in each case incarnated in great religious teachers, with Christ as the φέγγος or 'light' of the West in the one case, and Amida as the Dhyani Buddha of the West in the other . . . in short, I anathematise all the gods, Aeons, and derivative Aeons (*αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*—the Buddhas, Bosatsu, and Manushi Buddhas) whom Manes invented." It is hard to imagine at first how immense is the Pantheon of Buddhism in its Tendai and Shingon forms.

"I anathematise those that say that Zoroaster, Buddha, Christ, Manes, and the Sun—the five Dhyani Buddhas ending up with Vairocana = Dainichi = Amaterasu = the Great Sun—are one and the same (it is just what Shingon says) . . . that identify Christ with the Sun, and worship the celestial bodies (again Shingon) . . . that say that the souls of men are identical with God (again Shingon) . . . that teach that plants, trees, water, and such like things are endowed with souls" (Shingon again).

VII. One of the strangest identifications that I have found I got from St. Augustine, who was himself at one time a Manichaean. Among other things in his anti-Manichaean treatises (*e.g.* the division of believers into Hearers and Perfect, which is also found in Shingon) he tells us that the Manichaeans had a threefold system of sacramental or quasi-sacramental worship, based on ethical rules of life, and known as the *signacula* or *seals*. There were three seals, he tells us, of the

hand, the mouth, the heart,—*signaculum oris*, *manus*, *pectoris*. Strange to say, Shingon has the same—a threefold rule of life with conduct for body, mouth, and heart (Jap. *sangui*), and based on that threefold system of worship known as the *san-mitsu*, "the three secrets." When we come to inquire more particularly, we find that these secrets are actually called seals of the hand, the mouth, and the heart; the first consisting of certain ritual signs to be done with the hands during worship; the second, of certain formulae or mantras (dharani) to be recited; and the third, of certain acts of meditation to be made. The seals of the hands are all explained in the *Shidoindzu* in the *Annales du Musée Guimet*. The mantras or seals of the mouth are mostly unintelligible formulae, supposed to be Sanskrit, but not always so, and there is said to be only one man (eighty-one years old) who understands them. Of the meditations I could not learn much except that they did not differ materially from the *zazen* of the other sects.

VIII. As we come to know more of Japanese history we shall probably find some deep reason prompting the Government of that time to send over students of religion to China. All sorts of religious ideas were coming into the country as they had done a century before into China. Religious confusion, leading to spiritual unrest, was much to be dreaded, and a harmonious and harmonising system seemed an essential. Dengyō and Kōbō were both harmonists, and the *Ryobu Shinto* which they favoured brought quietness, if

it did not bring spiritual strength to the country. Consciously or unconsciously, Kōbō was a true disciple of Manes, and his system worked for great comprehensiveness, as did also that of its rival of Tendai.

CHAPTER V

BUDDHISM IN CHINA AND JAPAN

(*b*) *Daruma and the Mahāyāna Canon of Scripture*

Daruma is the name given in Japan to a peculiar legless doll which is often to be seen in the hands of children. It may be looked upon as the equivalent of our Noah's Arks, for it is in reality the image of a great Buddhist Saint. In China the Saint's name is Tamo, a personage held in so high esteem that the first missionaries thought that he was no other than the Apostle St. Thomas, whom legend has credited with the evangelisation of India and China. His real name is *Bodhidharma*. He was an Indian Buddhist, the son of an Indian Raja, who made his appearance in China about the year A.D. 520, where he founded the *Zen*[1] or *Dhyani* sect. This sect, under the name of *Busshinshu* (Sect of Buddha's mind), was brought into Japan as early as A.D. 654 by the monk Dosho, who failed, however, to gain much popular favour for

[1] Some Japanese writers connect the word *Zen* with *Jain*, but there is, I believe, no authority for such a derivation.

his teachings. It was re-imported in 1172 and 1194 respectively by Eisai and Dōzen, in two sections, the *Rinzai*, which came from the South of China, and the *Sodo*, which came from North of the Yangtze. The big Monasteries at Kamakura belong to the former ; the Sodo has its chief seat at the Eiheiji in Echizen.

To judge of Daruma's work it is necessary to speak first of the Canon of Northern Buddhism.

The first official appearance of Buddhism in China was in A.D. 67, when, in answer to the Emperor Ming-ti's invitation, two priests, Matanga and Dharmaraksha, brought Buddhist books, relics and images from N.W. India, and founded the monastery of the White Horse. Both these men died in A.D. 70, leaving behind them four books, of which only one now exists, the Sutra of the forty-two Sections. The next batch of missionaries came to China in A.D. 147, headed by the Parthian Prince, Anshikâo. The interval of seventy years was wholly taken up with controversies and persecutions, during which the Buddhists claimed to be miraculously assisted by a superhuman Power which supported them in all their trials and brought them out victorious. After A.D. 147 the stream of translators began. What the size of that stream was may be inferred from the fact that in A.D. 730, a short time before Dengyō Daishi came over from Japan, the Northern Buddhist Bible consisted of 5048 distinct works—with power to add to their number. The treatises were very miscellaneous. There are treatises on abstruse metaphysics, there are also treatises on the cure of

the toothache, and there are gods and goddesses, Buddhas and Bodhisattvas from every land that ever contained a Buddhist—Afghanistan, Persia, Central Asia, India. All claimed to have been originally written in Sanskrit. Sanskrit was the ecclesiastical language of Mahāyāna Buddhism, just as much as Latin was the ecclesiastical language of Mediaeval Europe.

The obvious results, which were felt less in India, where there was no importation of books, than in China, where missions came in from all sides, and where the stream was augmented by native additions, was a most alarming confusion of religious ideas. Several remedies suggested themselves.

I. *Eclecticism*.—Buddhist teachers took some particular Sutra or Commentary which appealed specially to their wants, and made the selected book or books the bases of their sectarian teaching. These are known as the "One Sutra one Commentary" Sects, and are very largely of Indian origin. The early sects in Japan (mostly extinct) which established themselves during the Nara period (Kusha, Hosso, Jojitsu, Ritsu, Sanron, etc.) belonged to this class. They were narrow and sectarian bodies, and both in Japan and China were disposed to quarrel amongst themselves. There is plenty of proof tending to show that about the Nara period (from A.D. 593 to A.D. 793) Buddhism in Japan was distracted by internal conflicts which were very disturbing to the whole country, and that the Emperor Kwammu's thought in sending Kōbō and Dengyō to China was mainly to obtain

some religious system which should bring peace to the country and secure the harmonious co-operation within the body politic of Buddhism, Confucianism, and the indigenous Shinto. I have already spoken about Kōbō and his work. It remains for me to speak of Dengyō's labours.

II. *The Harmonists.*—Eclecticism having failed, both in China and Japan, to bring forth good fruit, the way remained open for the Harmonists to try their hand. Was it possible to bring the chaos of Mahāyāna Scriptures into anything like order or system? The task exercised the ingenuity of many priests, both Indian and Chinese. *Kaigen* and *Chiko* among the former, *Eshi*, *Chisha*, *Genshu* and others among the latter, all tried their hands at it and failed. Emon Zenshi (A.D. 400) gave up the attempt in despair, and yet succeeded. Despairing of finding which was the principal Scripture to which the rest of the books should be subordinated, he shut his eyes, walked into the library, and took the first book his fingers touched. It happened to be Nāgārjūna's Madhyamaka Sastra, and he took it as the basis of his arrangement. "And this," says a Japanese writer, "is the basis of the Tendai sect!"[1]

[1] *Tsuzoku Bukkyo Gimon Kaito Shu*, vol. iii. 507, makes room in the highest place for the *Saddharma Pundarika*, which had been a favourite in Japan ever since the Prince Imperial Shotoku had himself delivered lectures on it in the precincts of the Palace at Nara. Dengyō's periods are the following: (i.) *Kegon* (Avatamsaka), a very exalted set of teachings delivered before Angels and Bodhisattvas, immediately after his Enlightenment, when the celestial glory was still upon Gotama. (ii.) *Agon* (Agama), simple teachings for sinful men, being the substance of his early preachings at Benares and elsewhere. (iii.) *Hōdō* (Vaipulya), the "expanded teachings" of a

Dengyō Daishi's system was a little different to that. The founder of the Chinese Tendai had supposed four great periods of development in the teaching of Sakyamuni, and had arranged all the Scriptures of the Three Baskets according to those periods, making the Madhyamika Sastra the key to the whole harmony. Dengyō Daishi added a fifth period to his harmony of the Master's life. It was perhaps too much to expect that so comprehensive a sect as the Tendai should continue for long in a pure and virtuous state. It had in it too much that was incongruous and incompatible, and too much that was worldly and carnal. It was the Court religion, and lent itself to Court intrigues during one of the most intriguing periods of Japanese history. It was torn into factions by the rivalries of ambitious priests and the conflicting claims of competing monasteries. The Hieizan monks were notorious fighters, and the history of Japanese Buddhism from A.D. 900 to A.D. 1250 is the record of a succession of

later period given to disciples with a certain amount of spiritual experience. (iv.) *Hanaya* (Prajna), containing the philosophy of his whole system; and lastly, (v.) *Hokke-Nehan* (*Saddharma Pundarika*, Nirvana), being the theological and ecstatic teachings of his last few years. In this way Dengyō Daishi hoped that he had formulated a comprehensive system in which there was room for the whole "84,000 articles of the orthodox Mahāyāna Faith," and certainly if the Truth can be obtained by boundless comprehensiveness Dengyō Daishi was on the way to attaining it. It took a student some twenty years to graduate in theology in the Buddhist University which Dengyō established on Hieizan, and it is extremely doubtful if he could have succeeded in his designs if he had not added to his theological requirements some very practical and beneficial labours of a different sort. But it does not require much critical acumen to know that no man—not even a Buddha—can possibly have been the expounder of all the Sutras.

protests from earnest-minded spiritual teachers against the corruptions of the dominant school of thought.

One of these protests was the protest of the Zen sects in A.D. 1172 and 1194, which I mentioned at the beginning of this paper. Both Eisai and Dōzen based their Protestant teachings on the doctrines formulated by Bodhidharma.

Daruma held with St. Paul that "the letter killeth." He did not trouble to investigate the Mahāyāna Scriptures, to select this book or reject that other. He simply put the whole on one side, and said that it was not by the Scriptures that a man could be saved. By clinging to a "One Sutra one Commentary" system a man became generally a narrow-minded bigot; by trying to follow the Harmonists and adopting all Scriptures he exposed himself to the danger of always learning and never coming to a knowledge of the Truth. The way of true Buddhism was simpler. Its main problem was to arrive at *Busshin*, at the "inmost heart of Buddha," and that was a task which each man must do for himself, by following the path which the Master had trodden first, which the Bodhisattvas and Patriarchs had trodden after him. By his own exertions, by the purification of his own heart, by a deep and constant contemplation of the most abstract kind, and growing deeper and more abstract with every exercise, he must reach out to Truths which Gotama had attained to under the *Bo-Tree*. Daruma's system is the Buddhist counterpart of the Spiritual Exercises of St. Ignatius Loyola, and the Zen faith

has always been the faith of soldiers and men of serious affairs. It was the faith of the manly Hojo Regents at Kamakura; it has always been the popular Buddhism of the samurai.

When once this enlightenment has been reached, the Zenshu believer will turn to his Scriptures and there find comfort. But he need not confine himself to the Buddhist Scriptures at all. Confucianism, especially that of the deep-reaching Oyomei School, has always been the strength and stay of the Zenshu priests and lay believers. In modern days, they will turn to Epictetus, to Tolstoi, to Emerson, to Goethe, nay, they will try to find "sermons in stones and good in everything." The Essence of Zenshuism is the "Heart of Buddha." But what that heart is cannot exactly be said. There is a carving at Nikko which tells the tale. Three monkeys holding their hands, one over his eyes, one over his ears, and one over his mouth, *mizaru*, *kikazaru*, *iwazaru* :—"Eye hath not seen it, ear hath not heard it, tongue hath not spoken it." The truth lies too deep for any but a communication from mind to mind. Oral transmission fails, the written fails still more signally. "All wise men," said Lord Beaconsfield, "are of the same religion: no wise man ever says what that religion is."

The Zenshuists claim, and I think with justice, that theirs is the most pure form of Indian Buddhism in Japan. They are certainly the most free of any of the Japanese sects from admixture of non-Indian elements. They represent as far as can be at such a distance of place and time the old

Buddhist faith that renovated India in the days of Gotama and As'oka, that fought against Hindoo philosophers and Brahman sages. They are the sturdiest and strongest, though not perhaps the most obtrusively active, of Buddhist sects at the present day.

CHAPTER VI

BUDDHISM IN CHINA AND JAPAN

(*c*) *Tendai and Shinshu*

I HAVE read in a Buddhist book published this summer (*Bukkyo Kakuha Koyo*) that the different sects ought to be arranged according to their *honzon*, or principal object of worship. This arrangement gives us three classes of Buddhist sects—those in which Vairocana is the *honzon*, those in which it is Sakyamuni, and, lastly, those which give the principal seat of honour to Amida.

The Tendai system, true to its characteristic spirit of comprehensiveness, tried to hold all three, but failed. It admitted Sakyamuni, Amida, and Vairocana, but it did not succeed in keeping its monks true even to one of these three. We find Tendai temples, like that *e.g.* of Asakusa, in which Kwannon is the *honzon* ; in others it is Yakushi or Kompira—the latter, I am told, a deified King from Chinese Turkestan, grafted on to a Hindoo god. The Tendai very soon split into sub-sects—partly from worldly reasons and partly owing to dogmatic considerations. There is a sub-sect of Tendai in

which Amida is the *honzon*, in contradistinction to the practice of the main body which principally reveres the glorified Sakyamuni as described in the *Hokekyō*, and no less than four sects of out-and-out Amida worshippers have left the Tendai and set up for themselves. It would take me beyond my present limits to go into a detailed account of these sects. Suffice it to say that the first sect, the one known as Yūdzūnembutsu and founded by Ryonen Shonin, A.D. 1123, is based on a vision in which Amida himself appeared to the founder of the sect, and told him to get out from the Hieizan Monastery, which was a den of demons, and take refuge in the One Being who summed up and stood for all Beings, and the One religious practice which summed up all religious rites. The Vision showed that the Hieizan required both moral reform and a simplification of dogma, but the Yūdzūnembutsu can scarcely be said to have been a success.[1] It has always been a small sect: its younger sisters, the Jōdo, founded by Genku and Honen in 1190, and the Shinshu, established by Shinran in 1224, have both been much more successful. They have appealed to Buddhist history and traditions, have boldly claimed to

[1] The *Yūdzūnembutsu*, contrary to the general practice, lays no claim to "Apostolic Succession" from the Buddhist Patriarchs. It is based on two Visions. In the first Amida appeared, disguised as a traveller, and told him to go out from his monastery and found a new sect based on Amida's Universal Intercession. In the second the visitant was a god named Bishamon. It is quite possible that the visitant in each case was a man, and the words of the communication, "One Man for All men, All men in One: One Rite for all rites, and all rites in One," suggest the possibility of his having been a wandering Christian. There are one or two cases known of Nestorian Christians having visited Japan in the early Middle Ages.

represent the true teaching of Sakyamuni in his later years, and have gathered three-quarters of Japanese Buddhists into their folds. There is one other Amida sect, the Ji, founded about 1275 (also as the result of a vision) but to all practical intents and purposes it is the Jōdo and Shinshu that practically monopolise the world of Amida worshippers.

These sects (they obviously came into existence in Japan from the necessity of presenting the people of this country with something more simple and practical than the extremely elaborate systems of Shingon and Tendai) all find their peculiar tenets in three Sutras—*Muryōjukyō Kwanmuryōjukyō* and *Amida-kyō*[1]—in which Sakyamuni discourses of the merits of another Buddha, as great as, or greater than Himself, who presides over a Western Paradise into which nothing that is undefiled may enter, and admission to which may be gained, quite irrespective of a man's *Karma*, simply by Faith in and Invocation of the Name of Buddha Amitābha. Like many (I might say all) of the Mahāyāna books, these three Sutras are not mentioned for centuries after Gotama's death. In the middle of the first century A.D., As'vaghosha mentions both Amida and the Sutra in his Awakening of Faith (*Kishinron*); we are told that Nāgārjūna died with his face set towards the Western Paradise; the brothers Asangha and Vasubaudhu believed on Amida in India of the

[1] *I.e.* the two Sukhāvati Vyūhas and the Amitāyurdhyāni Sutra. As'vaghosha's date makes him practically the contemporary of our Lord. We may place Nāgārjūna about A.D. 150-180 (one hundred and fifty years after the Buddha Sakyasinha) and Asangha and Vasubaudhu about A.D. 400 or 450.

fifth century A.D. In China, Amida books were brought in very early, *e.g.* by Lokaraksha in A.D. 148. Kumarajiva and others were great translators of these Sutras, and the so-called white Lotus sect, which is still in existence, has been the foster-mother of the Japanese sects which I have already mentioned. Any one who has given the least attention to Mahāyāna Buddhism will know how hard it is to assign a date to any Sutra coming from India. And if these Sutras are the genuine teachings of Sakyamuni, there is an interval of silence from 490 B.C. to A.D. 60, during which the Sutras are never once mentioned so far as we know.

I myself believe that the Sutras as we have them now are of a late date, much posterior to Shaka's time, and that the writings themselves should be classed as "Vaipulya" or "developed," containing doctrines given at first in a very simple form, but expanded and developed on some subsequent occasion. But, while believing the books themselves to be late, I think the teaching concerning Amida was actually given, *in germ*, by Sakyamuni himself during one of the last years of his life (say 485 B.C.). I will give the reasons which have led me to this conclusion.

There is a touch of time and place about the Amitāyurdhyāna Sutra which seems to my mind to bear all the marks of being essentially true. It is known that Gotama had, as one of his most earnest disciples, a King of Rajagriha, Bimbisara by name. Bimbisara had a bad son Ajātasatru, who, conspiring with Gotama's wicked cousin

Devadatta, plotted to dethrone his father and reign in his stead. The old King was accordingly thrown into prison, and by his son's orders kept on very short commons in the hope that he might die. Queen Vaidehi, however, managed to smuggle food into the prison, and the old King lived and throve. Then the wicked son redoubled the severity of the father's imprisonment, and Vaidehi was no longer permitted access to her husband in gaol. In her distress, she then sent for Buddha to come and give counsel and advice. "What have I and my husband done," she asked, "that we should be tormented with such a wicked son?" And "where is there a place that is free from sin and defilement, for I can find none in India?" She was quite right. There was no such teaching in India at the time, as may be seen from the accounts given of Gotama's discussions with various sages at the crisis when he was seeking after Enlightenment. In an ordinary Buddhist book Gotama ought to have told her a very prosaic *Jataka* story, of how, *e.g.*, she had been a butcher in some previous existence, and was now expiating her wickedness by one life of misery for every animal she had killed, and all the comfort he ought to have been able to offer her should have been that when all these thousands of sins had been expiated in some very remote future, she might possibly look forward to a better existence. Instead of that, with a refreshing inconsistency, Gotama sweeps aside the whole system of *Karma* (the only law that India until then knew), explains to Vaidehi

one or two religions—for I take the expression a Buddha-field to mean a religion—and bids her look for comfort in the West, in which *Karma* is for ever set aside through the merits of the Great Buddha of the Western regions. That is the germ of the Amida Cult. The idea is worked out and elaborated in the three Sutras ; the elaboration is, I think, of a later date, but the narrative I have related sounds to me like a genuine page from Sakyamuni's life.

The question at once arises, from whence did Sakyamuni obtain his knowledge of this western "Buddha-field" (or religion), with its principle of salvation by faith and purity of life, this faith which is outside of India, but which is yet destined to attract to itself converts from all the other Buddha-fields in the world, and whose Master is so exalted a personage that Sakyamuni can tell Vaidehi that "Amitābha is always near you"?

We might say that perhaps he foresaw it through his prophetic or spiritual insight, and we could not reasonably refuse to grant to Sakyamuni that gift which we grant to a Gentile prophet such as Balaam. But there is no necessity to suppose any prophetic gift at all.

When Sakyamuni came into the world, 550 B.C. or thereabouts, the great Babylonian Empire was in the height of its outward prosperity though inwardly tottering to its fall. The exiled Jews were there, and they were of two kinds—the pious souls who mourned for their sins by the waters of Babylon, and the money-grubbers who availed themselves of the opportunities of being in a first-

class commercial city to amass fortunes by trading with merchants from the East. Babylon was the London of the ancient world; Nebuchadnezzar had built for it a fine seaport, between which and India there was much coming and going. Sakyamuni, the bulk of whose disciples came from the merchant-class, cannot very well have missed hearing of Babylon. He was no cave-dweller; he lived amongst his fellow-men.

When Sakyamuni was a young man, the whole world was astonished by the sudden and awful fall of Babylon, and the rapid rise of the Persian Empire, a rise as phenomenal as that of Japan in our days. Events of this importance are not done in a corner. There was a stock exchange in Babylon, which must have been affected thereby, and which would in its turn affect the merchants of India who traded with that country. Sakyamuni must have heard of these things, for he cannot well have missed hearing of things connected with the Fall of Babylon. Fulfilled prophecies are apt to be exaggerated rather than minimised, and when the people from whose prophets had come the swiftly-fulfilled predictions of Babylonia's doom were restored to their country, it was a tale that would not lose by the telling in the bazaars of India.

About the year 520, the year in which Haggai and Zechariah began their prophetic ministry, Darius came to the throne of Persia. Darius extended the Persian dominions to India, as far as and perhaps beyond the Indus, into Punjaub. Sakyamuni was an itinerating preacher, and his

wanderings sometimes took him very near to the Persian frontier, being represented by a Mongolian chronicler as having engaged in controversy with Persian priests during his ministry, a story with which the *lama* in Rudyard Kipling's *Kim* was evidently familiar. His own people were the Sakyans, and there were members of the same tribe living within the territories of the new Persian Kingdom. In 513, Darius undertook his mighty expedition against the Scythians, and bridged the Dardanelles. Herodotus, who wrote the history of that expedition, gives us an account of the Sakyan troops who came from India and marched next to their Indian brothers-in-arms to chastise their Scythian or Sakyan cousins in Europe. The expedition against the Scythians was followed by the war with the Greeks. Sakyan troops fought at Marathon, watched the defeat at Salamis, and again fought at Plataea. It is incredible that Sakyamuni, who died a year before Salamis, should not have heard of the mighty Persian Empire, of its founder Cyrus, whom the Babylonian Isaiah recognised as the Servant of Jehovah, and of the new religious spirit which the Babylonian Captivity put into the hearts of the Jews, and through them, later, into the hearts of the world. The Western Buddha-field presided over by Amida was an echo of the spiritual teachings of the Jewish prophets of the Exile.

But this is by no means all, for it refers only to the germ out of which was developed the teaching of Amida, and we have said nothing yet about the written books.

Immediately after the death of Sakyamuni his elder disciples had a Council in a Cave-Monastery at Rajagriha, where they drew up a body of Scriptures, copied down from the memories of the Master's chief co-workers and apostles. Five hundred priests partook in this Council; but it did not command universal sympathy, for an opposition meeting was held outside the Cave, at which an independent set of teachings was made.

The opposition probably came from the men of Vaisali and the neighbourhood, from subjects of Bimbisara who had listened to the Master's later teachings and did not want to go back to the elements on which the older men insisted. Subsequently (some say one hundred years, but this is doubtful) a second Council was held, on the question of relaxations of discipline. The remonstrants could not get their way, and "trekked" across the frontier into non-Indian lands. They are called Vrijiputrakas; they were probably Sakyans from Vaisali, and it would seem that they went to seek a home amongst their Sakyan kinsfolk.

Herodotus (Bk. i.) tells of a Sakyan army that traversed Palestine and penetrated into Egypt.

Later, Sakyans (Buddhists probably by this time) fought in the Persian armies against Alexander, and after Alexander's death in the numerous armies which his successors raised for their frequent wars with one another. When their wars were over, the Greek Sovereigns of Antioch and the East did what the Romans after them did with such striking success: they formed

colonies of veterans, whom they placed in cities in different parts of the Empire, and whom they thus bound to themselves by free grants of lands and houses. There were many such colonies of veteran Scythians. Let me mention one—the town of Bethshan, on the confines of Samaria and Galilee ; its Greek name was Scythopolis, the city of the Sakyans. There was also the district of Decapolis ; and Galilee is known as "Galilee of the Gentiles."

When, under As'oka, 263-245 B.C., Buddhism became the dominant faith of India, a wave of missionary zeal came over the country and Buddhist missions went East and West, reaching as far as Egypt, Asia Minor, and Greece. These would naturally go to their brethren of the Buddhist and Sakyan Dispersion. The Persian Empire, let me add, was famous for its good roads and communications. These roads were kept up by their Greek successors ; and in India there is at least one famous high-road, marked with monasteries, that runs from Central India across the Punjaub into Afghanistan.

A hundred years later, during the wars of the Maccabees, about 150 B.C., we get the first mention made of the sect of the *Essenes*, a mysterious people living, both geographically and spiritually, on the confines between Jewry and the outside world. Much has been said about this strange people. It has been said that they were a sect of unorthodox Jews ; that they were the extreme Persianisers among the Jews, and carried the strict tendencies of the Pharisees to their logical conclusion ; that they were very good heathen of the Pythagorean

type ; that they were Buddhists pure and simple. It has been claimed for John the Baptist that he was an Essene ; the same thing has been alleged of Christ. It is pretty certain that neither was an Essene ; it is equally certain that there were certain spiritual affinities between the teachings of the Essenes and of Christ which made many of the former welcome the teaching of the Son of Man. Christ, as far as we know, never mentioned the Essenes ; He certainly never spoke badly of them, and many of His sayings were just what they would have said. The Essenes were very probably, in their origin, descendants of the mixed families which had been excluded from the temple by Ezra ; with them were mixed Buddhist Sakyans and others ; and their communities were increased, it is said, by additions from time to time from those somewhat Puritanical Jews who called themselves "the meek of the earth," and who wanted something more restful than the somewhat worldly religion of the Maccabean and Herodian priesthood, of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and scribes.

We get most of our knowledge of the Essenes from Josephus and Philo the Alexandrian. They lived a strict semi-monastic life, some as monks, others in the world but not of it ; they abstained from meat, and from the animal sacrifices in the Temple, to which, however, they sent offerings from time to time. They reverenced the Old Testament, but they had also books of their own which they kept secret, and certain spiritual Beings or angels whose names they were sworn not to reveal. They worshipped the Rising Sun, as symbol of their

Messianic hopes, a practice to which the prophet Malachi seems to refer when he speaks of the "Sun of Righteousness arising with healing in his wings"; and, what is most to our present purpose, they looked forward at death to entering into the Western Paradise.

The Jewish writer, Philo of Alexandria, speaks of the Essenes in the highest terms, as persons from whom he had learned a very great deal. It is to Philo that Christian theology owes the first indications of its highest mystery—the mystery of the Trinity,—for it is in his books that we get the first formulated belief in the Divine Logos or Word, and the first hints of the co-operation of Three Persons in the Divine Godhead. Is it chance, or is it the result of a sequence of cause and effect, that we find in the three Buddhist Sutras of the Amida Sects an indication of a Triad of Divine Persons, all interested in the Salvation of Mankind?

In each of the Sutras in question Amida appears; in each case he is accompanied by two Bodhisattvas, who aid him in his work of mercy. Their names in Sanskrit are Avalokitesvara and Mahasthāmaprāpta —"Infinite Mercy" and "Divine Strength,"—in Japanese, Kwannon and Seishi. *Kwannon* in the Jōdo books is male, not female. Stripped of the wild and fanciful legends with which the misguided devotion of a miracle-mongering Mahāyāna has covered him, he symbolises God becoming incarnate in many forms and on many occasions in order that he may save, not only all mankind, but all Nature; for Buddhism agrees with St. Paul that by reason

of sin "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain." *Seishi*, who, I am told, must not be identified with the Bodhisattva of the same name worshipped by the Shingon, is the symbol of Divine Force, Energy, Spirit—the Force of God. These, and these three only, are proposed to the Jōdo believer as objects of adoration in the Buddhist Scriptures which extol the Greatness of Amida, which set before man, even in this world, the hope of the Western Paradise, and proclaim the abolition of Karma through a Divine Person who has obtained for them what a Christian would call the forgiveness of all their sins.

It must not, however, be concluded that the relations of Amida and his attendant Bodhisattvas in the Jōdo Sutras are precisely the same as those existing between the Three Persons of the Christian Trinity. There are indeed many and most important points of difference, but into these I have no time to enter, nor is this the place to do so.

I would add, in conclusion, that there is a plainly marked difference between the three Sutras. The Larger Sukhāvati Sutra refers to the past: it tells of how Amida made His Vow, and how He raised Himself to His Place. The Amitāyur Dhyāna Sutra speaks of the present: it points Vaidehi to the Western Paradise as an actually accomplished fact, and shows how Amida's mercy suits the needs of all men and draws all men to himself. The Lesser Sukhāvati Vyūha speaks of the Western Paradise of the Future as the place of the Soul after death (and thereby again overthrows

the current Buddhism which knows no proper life after death, and no continued personal identity). The three principal Jōdo Sects (*i.e.* Yūdzūnembutsu, Jōdo, and Shinshu) do not agree, I am told, in the value they attach to these Sutras, each of them laying especially stress on one or the other book according as they lay more or less stress on present, past, or future.

It is significant that the concluding portion of the Larger Sukhāvati Vyūha is addressed in Sanskrit to *Ajita*, in Chinese or Japanese to *Miroku*, that is *Maitreya*, who is charged to "be valiant so that the laws of Buddhas may not perish or disappear." Now Maitreya is the Buddha of whom Sakyamuni foretold that 500, or, as some say, 5000, years after his decease Maitreya should come as the perfect Buddha to make perfect the Law.[1]

NOTE.—For the benefit of those of my readers who do not know the position of Mahāyāna Buddhism I may sum up the Shinshu doctrines, briefly, as follows :—

In common with every form of Mahāyāna Buddhism the Shinshu begins with the assumption of a Divine Essence, not Personal, inherent from all Eternity in the Universe. This principle the Japanese call *Butsu*, and is, roughly speaking, equivalent to the neuter *Brahma* of the Hindoos — the Immanent God, in fact. The Divine Essence shows itself from time to time in the persons of the Buddhas,—Beings who rise above the level of ordinary manhood and raise themselves to the Divine Level. There have been many Buddhas, each teaching in his own way, but all in the end working to the same goal, which is the salvation of their fellow-men. Thus we have (I give the Japanese names with which I am more

[1] I have been much criticised for this remark. I will appeal to the popular legend, but also to the colossus of Maitreya at Bamian, and the preaching which the Buddhists began after its erection. This happened about 500 years after Sakyamuni's death.

familiar) Dainichi, Yakushi, Sakyamuni, Ashuku, and a host of others—all Buddhas of equal rank.

The Shinshu (or Jōdo) sects select, from amongst these many Buddhas, one special Being, Amitābha, the Buddha of Infinite Life and Light, whose Home they place in the country to the West of India, in the "Western Paradise." Infinite ages ago this Amitābha was a monk of the Name of Hōzō (Japanese name). Hōzō was filled with compassion for the miseries of his fellow-men, whose fruitless efforts after salvation were truly pitiable to see. He therefore set himself to obtain the Power requisite for so great an undertaking, and for a long series of successive lives accumulated merit until he had reached the stage of a Bodhisattva, who at his death would be entitled to pass into Nirvana. But here he stopped. He looked back upon the world, saw his fellow-creatures in their hopeless misery, thought of all the long and arduous journey by which he had climbed, and made a vow that unless he could discover some simpler and easier way of salvation he would not accept the rest of Nirvana to which his own merits entitled him. In accordance with this vow he recommenced his austerities and penances, and at last succeeded in founding a Paradise into which all might enter, without labour or toil, who had faith to believe in what Amitābha had done for them, and to call upon his Name. This is Amitābha's Western Paradise or Pure Land. Those who enter it are freed from temptation, and go on to Perfection without let or hindrance.

Faith in Amida does not, however, destroy the Moral Law. Any one can have faith in Amida, and by Faith lay hold of salvation ; but having done so, the feeling of gratitude will compel him to keep the Law and walk worthy of his calling. Constantly praying, and meditating on salvation, he will practise the Virtues of a religious man, and so learn to know more and more of Amida in whom he trusts. There are nine stages in the knowledge of Amida. When the last stage is reached, the believer sees Amida in the full glory of his Trinity. For the Jōdo holds to belief in a Trinity, the three Persons of which are Amida, Kwannon, and Seishi. Buddhist priests have often said to me that Amida corresponds to our God the Father, and *Avalokitesvara* or *Kwannon*, the repeatedly incarnate Buddha of compassion and mercy, and

the spiritual son of Amitābha, to Christ. I have never heard it said that *Seisha* (Skt. Mahāsthāma *prāpta*) corresponds to the Holy Spirit. Seishi is comparatively insignificant.

In the *Hokekyō*, which I consider in the next chapter, there is the same underlying thought of an omnipresent Divine Essence, manifested over and over again in the persons of the Buddhas. But the *Hokekyō* (*Saddharma Pundarika Sutra*) says that there has been one all-embracing manifestation of the impersonal *Butsu* in the person of Sakyamuni—not necessarily the Gotama Buddha of history, but the glorified Sakyamuni of later Buddhist thought. The stout upholders of the *Hokekyō* say that Amida is only a partial manifestation, just as we say that the Jews had merely a partial, circumscribed, idea of God which has been completed and enlarged by Christian revelation.

I believe that Amida is taken from the Jewish conception of God, and the Sakyamuni of the *Hokekyō* from Alexandrian Christian and Gnostic thought. The Naassene hymn, and the description of the heresies of Alcibiades mentioned by Origen, which I discuss in Chapter XI., all point to some form of Amidaism as having been known, even in Rome, during the second Christian century.

CHAPTER VII

BUDDHISM IN CHINA AND JAPAN

(*d*) *Nichiren and the Hokekyō*

If we were wishing to pick holes in Japanese Buddhism, it would be the Japanese Buddhists themselves that would provide us with the pick to do it with. We have already seen, in a previous chapter, how vigorously Bodhidharma and his followers handled the Sacred Canon of the Mahāyāna Scriptures, and swept aside all the labours of the painstaking translator, the unscrupulous forger, and the ingenious harmonist, in one impartial condemnation. In the present chapter we shall see Nichiren, the greatest and most striking personality in the whole of Japanese Buddhist literature, passing the most scathing of condemnations on all his Buddhist brethren and predecessors, and proclaiming himself the Apostle of a Buddhist Belief so different to all that had gone before as practically to amount to a new religion.

Nichiren, born in 1222, began to propagate his new faith in 1253. The shadow of the Mongol was lying, black and gloomy, over a

great part of Asia. At any moment the dreaded conqueror might, as in fact he did a few years later, stretch forth a greedy hand towards the East, and send an Armada against Japan. The Empire, torn asunder by factions, her born leaders puppets in the hands of designing courtiers, lay at the mercy of any invader with faith to venture on the enterprise, when, in 1260, Nichiren published his patriotic essay, the *Ankokuron*, or Essay on the Tranquillisation of the Country, which he dedicated to the Hōjō Regent Tokiyori. Nichiren was banished to Izu for his audacity, but his words took effect. When the dreaded Mongols came they found Japan prepared.

Nichiren had begun his monastic life as a student in a Shingon Temple. He had then spent many years in study and wandering, sometimes at Kyoto, or Hieizan, sometimes at Nara, sometimes at Kamakura. He had read all the Sutras, and sat at the feet of many teachers of all sects and denominations. He found himself, in the end, profoundly disappointed. Not only did he consider that the results of Buddhism, as seen in the actual conditions of the country, were bad; but he came slowly also to the further conclusion that the true meaning of Buddhism had not yet been set before the world. The two discoveries went together in his mind. The country was in a bad state because its religious system was defective: if the religion could be made perfect, the condition of the country would improve: the time had now come to proclaim the perfect Law of the Tathāgata, and he was

the man to establish the perfect Religion, neither the Small Vehicle, nor the Large, but the One, True Vehicle.

As soon, therefore, as he was recalled from his banishment to Izu, he at once commenced an onslaught on the other sects which had brought such trouble on the country by their worldliness and heresies. The Nara sects, of the One Sutra and the Commentary, had signed their surrender, as it were, and lost their influence. They had allowed the identification of Vairocana Buddha with Amaterasu, the Shinto goddess of the Sun; they had made a compact with the Emperor Kwammu, which led to the despatch of Kōbō and Dengyō as commissioners to form a new State Buddhism; they had lost their spiritual independence, and consequently could not be expected to do much for their country's good. The followers of Kōbō had weakened their influence by placing mantras and incantations above the weightier matters of the Law; the monks of the Tendai had given in to the world, and had encouraged the constant resignations of men in authority which made all stable government impossible; the monks of the Jōdo and Shinshu Sects had followed suit and become as worldly as the Tendai, from which they had come out; and the Zen, with their claims of a direct personal revelation to each believer who seeks after the Truth by the way of meditation, could only be described as possessed of a Devil, so proud and self-conceited were they.[1]

[1] I may perhaps be allowed to mention here that the best account

None, said Nichiren, had hitherto understood the true of Buddhism, for none really understood the Person and Nature of its Founder. The Shingon placed Vairocana on their Altars, and the Shinshu, Amida: the one an alien deity, foreign to Buddhism; the other an Imperfect Buddha imperfectly apprehended by Faith alone, instead of by Faith and a changed heart,—a teaching so dangerous in Nichiren's eyes that he proclaimed that each several invocation of Amida's name would give the misguided worshipper a re-birth, not in the Pure Land, but in the lowest and hottest of the hells.

Nichiren's scathing denunciations of contemporary Buddhism brought him into trouble with the Regent. He was even condemned to death, so relentless were his enemies, and Japanese artists have often depicted the scene of his marvellous deliverance on the sands between Kamakura and Enoshima, when the raised sword of the executioner was stayed by a thunderbolt. But danger could not turn him from his purpose, and having by his criticisms cleared the foundations of religion, he proceeded to construct a new superstructure.

Five things are necessary, said Nichiren, for the promulgation of the true religion. There must be (i.) knowledge of the exact personal teachings of the man who founded it, (ii.) a knowledge

in any European language of the Zen or Contemplative Sects in Japan is one by Dr. Hans Haas on the *Mitteilungen der deutschen Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* (Tokyo). Pfarrer Haas is rapidly coming to the front rank of Japanologues. I have also at times derived much help from the excellent periodical *Mélanges Japonaises* published by the French clergy in Tokyo.

of the nature of man and mankind, (iii.) the right time, (iv.) the right place, and (v.) a knowledge of the past religious experience of the nations as well as a clear foresight of the future. All these he found, or thought he found, united in his own time and person. It had been made clear to him, and he felt himself commissioned to proclaim it to the world, that the whole of Shaka's personal teachings were to be found in the *Hokekyō*, the Scripture which taught with unfailing certainty the true Nature of man: the Age of Mappō, of the destruction of the Law, of the decay of Faith, demanded a teacher to put life into the dying embers. Japan, where the Mahāyāna had been taught in its fulness, was the country in which the advance could best be made from the Great Vehicle to the One True Vehicle, and that advance could best be made in accordance with past experiences and future hopes, the medicines to heal the sicknesses of the age being administered only after a most careful diagnosis of the religious and moral symptoms.

In the *Hokekyō*, said Nichiren, is to be found the true Sakyamuni as revealed by himself before his death. He is not, as the Small Vehicle teaches in the *Agama* Sutras, a mere man born in Central India, who went about doing good, and teaching the simple elements of a simple faith to men and women, entangled in mundane affairs. Neither is he the superhuman Buddha, sixteen feet in bodily stature, whose footpoints may be seen, *e.g.* on the great stone in front of the Zōjōji Temple in Shiba Park. Sakyamuni, according to Nichiren,

is more than this. He is the Great Self of the Universe—the Immanent God, if we may adopt the language of modern speculation. He is "above all, through all" : man in Him is partaker of the Divine Nature, and not man alone—every rock, every sea, every planet, the Sun, the Moon, and the most distant of constellations, all are manifestations of the Buddha Nature, all are parts and parcels of Sakyamuni. There have been many Buddhas and many Buddha-fields, but these are but partial Buddhas, each exhibiting but a portion of the whole Truth. In Sakyamuni, unbounded, uncreated, self-enlightened from all eternity, and in Him alone, dwells the whole "fulness" of the Buddha Nature.[1]

The Christian theologian will gaze with astonishment when he first realises the main thought underlying the teachings of Nichiren. "These," he will exclaim, "are the speculations of the Alexandrian Gnostics, of Basilides and his crew. These are the problems which exercised the mind of St. Paul when he wrote to the Colossians and Ephesians, and which prompted the Author of the Fourth Gospel to pen (may we not say, under Divine Guidance?) his great Prologue about the "Word which is from the beginning and which is God." The surprised exclamation of the theologian would not be so very

[1] Nichiren, in one of his Commentaries, expresses this in a quaint manner. Speaking of Amida, he says that he cannot be a great Buddha, for though summoned to the great assembly at the Vulture's Peak, he was not permitted to stick out his tongue when he got there! Any one who has read the *Saddharma Pundarika* will understand the joke.

far from the truth. I hope to be able to show that there is a good deal of connection, historical as well as logical, between the speculations of Alexandrian divines and the doctrines enunciated by Nichiren.

The earliest known translation into Chinese of the *Hokekyō* belongs to the period of the Western Tsin dynasty, A.D. 265-316, though the best version, that of Jnānagupta and Dharmagupta, dates from as late as A.D. 601. Kumarajiva's translation dates from between 384-417. All these versions, it will be seen, are posterior even to the age of Manes. The original book must, however, have existed in Manes' time, and must have been a very well-known book to have so many versions made of it. The earliest translator, Dharmaraksha, was a Chinaman, descended from a *Yuetchi*, a branch of the Scythian family; its great translator, Kumarajiva, though born in India (at Kharacar) was educated at Kubha (Kabul). The book is therefore in all probability not of Indian origin, but Sakyan or Scythian, and I hope in this lecture to be able to throw some real light on its origin.

The book itself consists of two parts of unequal value. These are described by the late Abbot Kobayashi of the Nichiren College, Takanawa, Tokyo, as the "Original" and the "Subordinate" Sections, and Professor Kern of Leiden, in his Preface to the English Translation of the Sutra (vol. xxi. of *S.B.E.*), says that the "Original" portion comprises chaps. i.-xx. with the epilogue, the "Subordinate" or later sections

being chaps. xxi.-xxvi. of the book as it now stands. Thus the "Original" book consisted of twenty-one chapters, of which one is in some versions divided into two, a fact which it is well to bear in mind. We shall come back to that presently.

The "Subordinate" portions give the impression of consisting of a number of independent tracts loosely connected with and appended to the main volume. Some chapters are mere rubbish, as for instance that on *Spells*, giving a number of magical formulae intended to protect the preachers from the dangers of their mission. The chapter on the Many-Sided One (the so-called Fumonbon) gives the fullest account we have of the doctrine of Avalokitesvara, the male Kwannon,[1] and there is a chapter which possibly brings us very near to

[1] *The Male Kwannon.* The deity Kwannon, or Avalokitesvara, is always male in India, and nearly always female in China and Japan. The Taoists tell a story, which I only mention to condemn, that the female Kwan-yin is really a deified prostitute whom a Chinese Prince raised to the rank of a deity. Kwannon really represents the Mercy of God, which assumes many shapes and appears in many incarnate forms. I have a little catechism, entitled *Kwannon no kudoku*, which says that Kwannon has been incarnate many times in many different forms, sometimes as a man, sometimes as a woman, sometimes even as an animal, and that the so-called *Roku-Kwannon*, or six-shaped Kwannon, represents the Mercy of Buddha in the six spheres of existence. The same Catechism states that Socrates, Christ, Mahomet, Kant are all to be looked upon as Incarnations of Kwannon, a statement which would agree with Mrs. Besant's theory that, at the Baptism "Jesus walked out of His Body and Buddha walked in." The theory was not unknown to the early Christian Fathers. Irenaeus (*e.g. Adv. Haer.* i. chap. xxi.) discusses the question of the bisexual nature of Christ as taught by some of the Gnostic heretics, who looked upon Christ as only one in a series of successive incarnations. It seems to me that the chapter on the Many-Sided One in the *Hokekyō*, and the discussions on heresies in Irenaeus, are calculated to throw a very great deal of light on one another.

the New Testament. It will be remembered that St. Paul had but little use for the man who "gave his body to be burned" and had no charity. An instance had occurred at Athens of a "Samanaean" (*i.e.* sramana) who actually did thus give his body to the flames, and it is supposed that St. Paul had this instance in his mind when he wrote.[1] In chap. xxii. of the *Hokekyō* (*S.B.E.* vol. xxi. p. 370) an instance is given of a Bodhisattva who actually did so, and his self-immolation is praised as "real heroism," as "the real worship of the Tathāgata, the real worship of the Law." And, significantly enough, there are no traces in the whole narration of what St. Paul has taught us to consider as "charity" in the true sense of the word.

The "Original" portion is a strangely composite work, a collection of documents not very skilfully strung together into a sort of Buddhist Apocalypse.

Part of it is prose and part of it is verse, prose and verse repeating each other, so that the whole contents of the book are duplicated. It is im-

[1] The man's name was *Zarmanochegas*. He was a member of an Indian Mission sent to Rome in 37 B.C. by *Porus*, who represented (so he said) a coalition of native Kings, the object of the Mission being to consult with Augustus. This man voluntarily burned himself to death at Athens, where a monument was erected to his memory, which Strabo the geographer describes, and which St. Paul must have seen. Edmunds and Anezaki in their *Buddhist and Christian Gospels* think that the man cannot have been a Buddhist, because Buddhism forbids suicide. But the *Hokekyō* is against them on this point, for this kind of religious self-immolation is (*l.c.*) very highly commended. It seems possible that this Indian Mission to Augustus may be of great value in fixing the date of the Mahāyāna. Porus evidently appealed for help to Augustus, and we know that, some years later, Kanishka's armies advanced as far as Benares, the King of which was forced to give hostages, of whom As'vaghosha was one.

possible to decide which is the earlier, the prose or the verse, but the fact of there being both versions points to a late date of composition, a point emphasised by the allusion (on p. 45) to "Sutras and Stanzas, legends, birth-stories, prodigies and parables" as part of the preacher's stock-in-trade. Other indications of a late date are to be found in the frequent allusions to the writing and copying of this Sutra (the Ceylon books were not reduced to writing much before the middle of the first century B.C.) as well as in the commendation given (p. 50) to those who made statues of the Tathāgata and honoured them with worship. It was apparently after Alexander's invasion, and from the Greeks, that the Indians learned the arts of sculpture and building in stone.

The book is ushered in, as it were, with apologies. It is a Dharmapariyaya (Gospel) which will meet with opposition in the world (p. 17); it has been rejected during the lifetime of the Tathāgata (p. 219); five thousand monks went away from Sakyamuni's lecture when first they heard it preached (p. 38); the heretical monks of the Small Vehicle accuse the writer of forgery and plagiarism (p. 260), and the rejection will assuredly be greater after the Tathāgata has gone to his rest (p. 219).[1]

The book falls roughly into four parts.

1. *Introductory*. A statement of the Gospel to be announced. Sakyamuni is the Self-born Buddha, begotten before all worlds, and what he offers to man is not Nirvana, not extinction, but

[1] See note at the beginning of next chapter.

the endless life which consists in Perfect Enlightenment. The doctrine may seem a new one to the reader; it is defended by a series of parables. The potter makes many vessels; each has different uses, though all are of the same clay. The rain comes down upon a garden; the water is all the same, yet each plant takes the special nourishment it requires. An anxious father sees his children in danger of conflagration; he coaxes them out of the burning house by offers of toys, suited to their individual tastes; when they come to claim his promise they find that they have all received the same. Another father finds his long-lost son among beggars and thieves; he does not, however, make himself known at once; he engages him as a hired servant, promotes him step by step as he shows himself fit, and in the end proclaims him as the Crown Prince of his kingdom. So, to put the thing into Christian parlance, the potter has power to fashion the clay as he pleases; souls saved are as "brands plucked from the burning"; God's rain comes on the just and the unjust, and each derives from it the blessing he needs; the labourers in the vineyard each get their penny; the prodigal is restored when he has come to himself.

2. *The Promises.* The doctrine laid down in the Introductory Chapters is given a personal application. To each one of the principal hearers is the promise made of future Enlightenment and Perfection. Next comes a wonderful section which I call,

3. *The Presence.* Whilst Sakyamuni is speak-

ing, there descends from heaven a *Stūpa*,[1] a Shrine, not unlike the Tabernacle which may be seen over the Altar in Roman Catholic Churches, and from the Shrine a voice, expressive of satisfaction and happiness. "This is my Body," says the Tathāgata, pointing to it, "and whenever this Gospel of mine is preached, my Body will be present" (pp. 227-228). The Stūpa emits a seven-fold light of seven precious substances: it contains the remains of the Buddha Prabhutaratna (Jap. Tahō), who is "dead yet speaketh," and who is identified with Sakyamuni. Strange to say, in another part of the book there is another Buddha (p. 173) also identified with Sakyamuni. This Buddha preached what Gotama preached. Prabhutaratna had preached the higher Buddhism of the Mahāyāna doctors, those truths which were contemporary with and not far different from the teachings of Him Whose words are recorded for us in the Synoptic Gospels, and now the self-born Eternal Buddha, preaching the One Vehicle, promises his presence to his followers, and the Eternal Life which is the same thing as Perfect Enlightenment.

4. *The Concluding Vision.* Preachers full of zeal and armed with divine protection go forth to preach the new Gospel. They dwell in the "abode of the Tathāgata" which is "charity," wear his "robe" which is "sublime forbearance," and occupy his "pulpit"—indifference to all

[1] Clement of Alexandria mentions *Buddha* and also *Stūpa*. This is a small point, yet it shows that these things were known in Alexandria.

things human or transient (p. 222). As a result of their labours a multitude "which no man can number" gathers around the Tathāgata, headed by four Bodoisatva Mahasatva, four "living creatures," who are the latter-day attendants of the Eternal and Everlasting Buddha. Presently the curtain drops, and the Apocalypse is ended.

The imagery of this extraordinary book is all Indian, absolutely fantastical, and tediously prolix; but the underlying thought is all Christian and Alexandrian. The thoughts are common to all the Alexandrian writers, to Basilides, to Clement, to Origen. At every turn we are reminded of the New Testament, not in word-coincidences, but in ideas and underlying thoughts. I believe that I have reason for identifying it as a book that was known to some at least of the Greek Fathers of the second and third centuries A.D., and as the work of an Indian Buddhist residing at Alexandria during the second century A.D., or at least written by one who was acquainted with Alexandrian thought and by him brought to Alexandria.

I have already in my first lecture noted the existence, in the third century of our era, of four Buddhist books which lay at the basis of the teachings of Manichaeus. These books hailed from Alexandria, at any rate they were found in Alexandria by Terebinthus, who was afterwards called Buddha. Alexandria, we know, swarmed with Indian merchants, especially after the reign of Tiberius, when the Romans first learned the art of navigating the Red Sea by observing the

prevalent winds. We have found traces of the doctrines of Basilides in the peculiar God of the secret Shingon—*Abara-ka-kusu*—and we know that there must have been a good deal of interchange of thought between India and Egypt. Scythianus, the original author, may well have been *Sakyamuni*, the supposed speaker of the *Hokekyō*, or some Sakyan Buddhist. The term Dharmapariyaya, which so constantly appears, might very well be translated by *Gospel*, which is one of the names of the Scythianus books.[1] It is a Gospel with nothing in it of the Gospel, as Cyril of Jerusalem says, and yet pregnant with Christian ideas turned aside to Buddhist uses. It is, as Epiphanius notes, Aristotelian and Pythagorean—a statement which is true, in spite of the fact that India also held the view here enumerated; for the one taught the immanence of God, and the other the doctrine of constant re-births according to *Karma*. All internal evidence goes for its having been composed during the first or second century of the Christian era, that age of decay and confusion,[2] which witnessed the birth agonies

[1] The Scythianus books are mentioned by Cyril of Jerusalem, Eusebius of Caesarea, and Epiphanius. The first two were residents in Palestine, and possibly had good authority for what they said. In the July-April numbers of the *Journal A. S. Great Britain* for this year there are articles by Mr. Kennedy which show the close connection, tradal and intellectual, that existed between Alexandria and India at this period. Alexandria was the home of Neo-Pythagoreanism, and the spurious "Theology" of Aristotle exercised a great influence upon Neo-Platonist and Neo-Pythagorean philosophers.

[2] The middle of the first century A.D. was a period of great natural calamities and troubles in Europe, a subject on which Farrar has a very excellent chapter in his *Early Days of Christianity*. The

of Christianity on the one hand and Mahāyāna Buddhism on the other. We can see that it is an attempt to bring about harmony between conflicting schools of Buddhism by proclaiming the perfect Buddha and his perfect Vehicle, as against the lower teachings of the Smaller and Greater Vehicles, by means of elements borrowed from Christianity. We can understand that its missionary Terebinthus may well have wished to enlarge its scope from pagan Gnosticism to Christian Gnosticism by incorporating into it more of Christian elements, and have gone to Jerusalem to confer with the Apostles about it. We can understand that Apostles and Apostolic men rejected with scorn a Gospel which left out the Cross, and taught an immanent God and a series of reincarnations of the Saviour. And so we may well suppose that the *Saddharma Pundarika* lay fallow in the library of Terebinthus until the boy Cubricus found it and made thereof the basis of the Manichaean heresy. The book that Cubricus used was probably not written in Sanskrit; the Sanskrit text, as I have pointed out, is a very composite work, probably of later origin; but it is a significant fact that, like our present *Hokekyō*, it consisted of twenty-two books. The subsidiary chapters in the former may possibly be portions of the other books which Manes found

same was the case in Asia. For instance, the Oxus river violently changed its course during the century and desolated an immense area of country in so doing. This was but one instance out of many. The period was also marked by conflicts between Scythian invaders of India and Hindoo patriots, between whom the Buddhist monks fared badly.

and which have been tagged on to the main volume.

The disciples of Nichiren, Daibosatsu, believe him to have been a reincarnation of Jōgyōbosatsu, the first of the four Great Ones whom we saw standing at the head of the multitude which no man can number before the throne of Sakyamuni the Eternal.

Christianity also has something to tell of a "Fourfold" Ministry, of Four Living Creatures in the Heavenly Sanctuary, of Apostles and Prophets, Evangelists and Pastor-Teachers, whose work is the edifying of the Saints, the building up and perfecting of the Church, until the Unity of the Church be reached and the measure of the stature of Christ.

CHAPTER VIII

SERMONS FROM BUDDHIST TEXTS (I)

The Lion of the Sakyas is to make an exhortation, to declare the fixed nature of the Law. Be well prepared and well minded : join your hands : He who is affectionate and merciful to the world is going to speak, is going to pour the endless rain of the Law and refresh those that are waiting for Enlightenment. And if some should feel doubt, uncertainty, or misgiving in any respect, then the Wise One shall remove it for his children, the Bodhisattvas here striving after Enlightenment.—*Saddharma Pundarika*, chap. i. p. 29 (in *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxi.).

THE speaker in my text assumes the name of the Lion of the Sakyas (a tribe well known in the annals of India and the neighbouring mountain countries), and describes himself as affectionate, merciful, and wise. He is going to speak to his children, not, that is, to the whole of Creation, nor even to the whole of mankind, but to the select few among men who deserve the honourable title of Bodhisattvas, the "called Saints," as St. Paul would term them, who are striving after complete Enlightenment. And the subject of his discourse is the "fixed nature of the Law," the eternal and abiding principles which underlie human life in its religious aspects.

The book from which my text is taken is one of the latest, and at the same time one of the most popular, books among the Buddhists of the Northern School. In Nepaul and Tibet, in China, Korea, and Japan, it has for fully fifteen centuries been the great storehouse from which Buddhist preachers have drawn themes of exhortation and comfort for the faithful who have come to listen to their Sermons. It looms, in the mind of Japanese Buddhists, as something extremely great and awe-inspiring, and its position among the five thousand odd volumes which compose the Buddhist Canon of China and Japan has been compared to that of a king amongst his subjects. There are ranks and degrees among the subjects, and some approach nearer to the throne than others, but between the highest of the subjects and the Majesty of the Emperor there is a very wide and impassable interval. Such is the *Saddharma Pundarika* among the other Scriptures of Northern Buddhism.

The book claims to contain the latest teachings of Sakyamuni, and to be a summary of the teachings delivered by him during the last few years of his earthly life. It is very largely accepted as such by the Japanese Buddhists of the present day; but there are Higher Critics in Japan as well as in England, and these men hold that the book cannot possibly be looked upon as a genuine product of Sakyamuni's own lifetime. It is later than the separation of Buddhism into the two schools known as the Greater Vehicle and the Lesser; it is later than the introduction of painting

and sculpture for religious purposes ; it is later than the troubles which befell Buddhism four or five hundred years after the Nirvana of the Master. There are competent Japanese critics, and I think we need not quarrel with them, who place the book at the end of the first, or middle of the second century of our Christian era, at the time when Buddhism was admittedly undergoing a great revival, and setting out on its great career as a missionary religion in the Far East.[1]

Now, assuming this date to be the correct one, we have to notice, first, the great change which had come over the minds of Buddhist believers during the years that had elapsed since the Indian sage lived on earth in the fifth or sixth century B.C. To his contemporaries, Buddha was undoubtedly a man: a very human teacher, full of love, compassion, mercy, but full also of practical common sense in his dealings with mankind. His work in India was like that of the prophets of the Old Testament, like that of Jesus Himself in His years of Ministry, to free man from those artificial shackles and restraints which custom and tradition, masquerading under

[1] One of the greatest losses in the burning of my unfortunate book was that of a most masterly essay by the Rev. Mr. Nukariya, a priest of the Sōdō Sect, on the date of the *Saddharma Pundarika*, which he placed some five or six hundred years after the death of Sakyamuni. In this conclusion I follow him. The most potent reason, however, for fixing upon this date is to my mind the fact that the book constantly speaks of *Three Vehicles*. The *Second* Vehicle, the Mahāyāna, was definitely completed at Kanishka's Council at Peshawar (about A.D. 40), when the Abhidharma and Commentaries of the Great Vehicle were drawn up. And it seems reasonable to suppose that there would be no need for a Third Vehicle until after the full and definite establishment of the Second.

the name of Law, had imposed upon his spiritual freedom. But signs are not wanting to show that, even during his lifetime, men began to invest him with something more than the attributes of a mere man. When he died, his remains, reverently divided amongst the great men of India, were placed by loving hands under magnificent *stūpa* shrines, which became the centres of Buddhist worship, and extremely ancient inscriptions and wall-pictures attest that, like our own Christ, his birth was soon invested with a superhuman character and dignity. Buddha's was a Virgin Birth, though, even so, differing from the Birth of Christ, inasmuch as what lay in the womb of Māyā was not the Most High, but only the spirit of a pre-existent saint seeking a reincarnation as the last step to the attainment of a perfect Buddhahood. Still, such as it was, in Buddhist eyes it was a matter of holy joy, and poets, painters, and sculptors have vied with one another in doing honour to the Virgin Birth of Gotama, or Sakyamuni.

Years rolled by and Buddhist experience widened, Buddhists in the lands of N.W. India and Central Asia, passing successively under Persian, Greek, Parthian, and Scythian domination, got a wider outlook. They saw that other lands too had had religious teachers whose doctrines were not much different from those of their own great sage, and we must give them all credit for their readiness in acknowledging the good they found amongst others. They opened their arms wide to embrace many religions and many gods. Above all religions, and above all gods, they

placed those great souls whose eyes have been opened to the Everlasting Truths, and so they spoke of many Buddhas and many Buddha-fields. The Buddhas were different and distinct; each one cultivated his own Buddha-field in his own way, and taught the truth according to his opportunities. But the substratum of it all was the same: Greek, Persian, Bactrian, Indian, Jew, all were striving after enlightenment.

It was thus probably that was introduced into Buddhism the teaching of Amitābha, the Buddha of Infinite Light, Life, and Compassion, whose Buddha-field was in the West. Sakyamuni was contemporary with, if not posterior to, the great Hebrew Prophets of the Babylonian Captivity, and that he was acquainted with Persia and Persian thought seems to be proved by the fact that in the Mongolian biography, quoted first by Klaproth,[1] he is described as having more than once been engaged in controversy with Persian fire-worshippers. When his friend Queen Vaidehi was in distress, and no human help was at hand for her comfort, Sakyamuni pointed her to that Buddha of the West, full of light, love, life, and compassion, who was an ever-present help in time of need. When Sakyamuni spoke, Amitābha was the Buddha of the West, but the Scripture which speaks most explicitly of Him, also predicts that the time would come when men from other Buddha-fields should desire to join themselves to the Buddha-field of Him Whose Life and Light are Infinite.

[1] Klaproth, *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*, ii. p. 81.

But we can trace another step in the development of Buddhism. If there are many Buddhas and many Buddha-fields, and many gods in many lands, to all of whom the Buddhist may give due worship and praise, we get a very large circle of deities, great and small, and Buddhism does not differ very much in this respect from the Hindoo idolatry which it had come to displace. There is no doubt that thoughtful minds among the Buddhists felt this. As we come down nearer to the times of Christ, to the centuries of confusion and darkness in the midst of which the True Light came, we find Buddhists talking of the *Mandala*, a term which is used to denote "the sum-total of all that calls itself divine, conceived of as a Unit," and embracing all gods, Buddhas, and Saviours within one comprehensive ring. The *Mandala* thus brought about unity in midst of the diversity. It was a step in the right direction. God has revealed Himself, says the Christian Apostle, *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως*, "in many fragments and in many ways," and though the author was thinking at the moment only of God's revelation to the Hebrews through their Prophets, the principle also holds good of the Revelation of God, "piecewise," to the nations outside His Covenants of Grace.

The Gnostics, who were the contemporaries of the Mahāyāna Buddhists, and first cousins (if not something nearer), were acquainted with the *Mandala*, and translated it into Greek by the word *πλήρωμα*, and there is more than a mere casual resemblance between the *Pleroma* as described, say, by Valentinus, and the *Mandala* as worshipped by

Japanese Buddhists such as Kōbō Daishi or Nichiren. St. Paul also knew it, and described it in terms which are familiar to us all. "In Christ," he says, "dwells all the fulness (*pleroma*) of God in a bodily shape." All that the sum-total of heathen gods contains, or expresses, is united in Christ as St. Paul saw Him. There is no need to turn to any one else; for in Christ we have everything.

Strange to say, exactly the same thought is to be found in the *Saddharma Pundarika*, from which my text is taken. Sakyamuni is the *Pleroma*, the *Mandala*. He, Begotten before all Worlds, is the sum-total of all that is divine or that is worshipped in the whole Universe. He is the sole Lord that claims allegiance; the other Buddhas, the Gods, and the Saints, are but partial emanations (Nichiren calls them *Bun-shin*, "partial-bodies") of the One Divine Essence which has become Human in Sakyamuni.

This Sakyamuni is to the Buddhist exactly what Christ is to the Christian; and it is passing strange that these two Figures so strikingly similar should appear on the world's stage at almost the same moment. I am not referring at this moment to the Indian sage and Jesus of Nazareth,[1] but to the glorified Sakyamuni of the *Saddharma Pundarika*, and the risen, glorified, and exalted Christ of Whom St. Paul constantly speaks.

"It is impossible," says the Christian; "there cannot be two Christs." "It is impossible," says

[1] There is an interesting passage in Epiphanius (*Adv. Haer.*) in which, speaking of the Manichaeans, he describes them as talking of the Christ (of the Synoptic Gospels) as ὁ ἐν τῷ μικρῷ σκεύει Χριστός —"Christ in the Small Vehicle."

the Buddhist; "there cannot be two Sakyamunis such as described in our great Sutra. We can accept your Christ as a partial manifestation: we cannot find room for two Pleromas in one Universe."

It is, however, possible that the two may be found to be intended as variant pictures of One and the Same Divine Person, and my aim in this book is to try and establish that identity; for I feel sure that if I can do so, the world, Christian and Buddhist alike, will be the gainer. It is no longer the fashion to introduce prayers into Sermons; perhaps in these Sermons, preached from a writing-table and not a pulpit, I may be allowed to pray that I may have wisdom, boldness, and charity in unfolding, and my readers, patience and forbearance in reading, that so the result of my work may be to edify, not to destroy, to bind together and not to scatter.

CHAPTER IX

SERMONS FROM BUDDHIST TEXTS (2)

"The Tathāgata is about to deliver a grand discourse for the teaching of the Law and make his grand speech on the Law everywhere heard. . . . And because the Tathāgata wishes that this Dharmaparyâya meeting opposition in all the world be heard everywhere, therefore does he display so great a miracle."—*Saddharma Pundarika*, chap. i. p. 17.

LET me begin by asking my readers to call to mind what we, as Christians, believe about Our Lord Christ. We believe, do we not, that after Our Lord's ministerial life of active benevolence and holy warfare had come to an end, when He was about three and thirty years of age, He was betrayed by false disciples into the hands of His enemies, and, after a most unjust and flagrantly insufficient trial, put to a shameful death upon a malefactor's cross? We believe also that that Death was really our Life, that it was the proof and measure to us of the Love of God in Christ for His children, that it became the full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice and Atonement for the sins of the whole world, and that wherever it has been acknowledged it has succeeded in abolishing human and animal sacrifices, far more completely than

Buddhism has succeeded in doing in its own native India. We believe, further, that Christ rose from the dead, that He ascended into Heaven, and that, as a last proof of His accomplished mission, He sent the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, in such a manner that the Wonder was known throughout all the world. The Day of Pentecost we often speak of as the Birthday of the Christian Church, and, if we were strictly logical in all that we do, should probably commence our reckoning from it rather than from the Nativity; for the Crucifixion was really the end of the old era, and the new age of the world's history really began on the first Whitsunday.

We must, however, bear in mind that whilst doubters to-day question the fact of the Resurrection, and accept the Crucifixion as an assured fact, those of the Apostolic days doubted the Crucifixion rather than the Resurrection. That Christ had reappeared after His Crucifixion, they doubted not at all; the question with them was: Had He really died? and they invented theories known as *Docetic*, which explained away the Crucifixion as an illusion. Christ had not died, they said, He had but swooned, or it was but a phantom that hung upon the Cross. All the heresies of the first two centuries were tinged with Docetism.

Now turn to Buddhism. When Sakyamuni had finished that long ministry of fifty years, which, like the ministry of Hebrew Prophets and Lawyers, prepared the way for Christ, so that all could be accomplished by Him in three short years of activity, he died quietly on his bed, surrounded

by a large company of his faithful disciples. Kings and Princes vied with each other in doing honour to his relics, and many magnificent temples, raised in several parts of Central and N.W. India, proclaimed with no uncertain voice that Sakyamuni was dead. But a time came when Buddhists asked the same question: Did Sakyamuni really die? And the writer of the *Saddharma Pundarika*, like the Gnostic heretics, proclaims that he did not die. "Without being extinct," he says,[1] "the Tathāgata makes a show of extinction . . . on knowing that his sons are delivered from evil, he shows himself again," a statement which reminds us of what St. Paul says of Christ (Rom. iv. 25), viz. that He was delivered for our sins and raised again because we were justified (*διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν*), as though not till that justification had taken place had He been willing to enter into His glory.

The writer, then, of the *Saddharma Pundarika* is a Docetist. He believes the Death of Sakyamuni to have been only a pious device on the Master's part, and he contemplates the possibility of the Master's reappearance. This will, perhaps, throw some light on the form the book assumes.

The opening scene is laid at the Vulture's Peak, one of Sakyamuni's favourite resorts. A large company is assembled, of prominent disciples, lay followers, saints, gods, demons, heavenly beings, male and female, of Bodhisattvas and Buddhas, past, present, and for to come. All

[1] *Saddh.* chap. xv. pp. 303, 304, 306 (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxi.).

are waiting to be taught, but the Master is silent. He is *absorbed in a meditative trance*. Presently a wonder takes place. There is a shower of celestial flowers, and a ray of light coming from between the Blessed One's eyebrows illuminates the whole Universe so that everything is laid bare before the eyes of the spectators. What can this portent mean? ask the spectators. And Manjusri the Prince Royal, the wisest of the Bodhisattvas there present, who has had wide experience of past ages, and who knows that that which has been is that which shall be, and that there is nothing new under the Sun, replies that, judging from his past experience, the portent means that the Tathāgata is about to make a new exposition of the Law, that the Drum of the Law is going to be beaten, and the Wheel of the Law turned. Mankind is to be entrusted with a new Truth, and a new era or Aeon is to begin for the world. The surmise is a correct one; the Tathāgata presently awakes from his trance, and announces a new truth which fills his hearers with a truly Pentecostal joy and energy. The perfection of man is not merely that he should attain to a Nirvana of freedom from pain; nor even to a Nirvana of perfect knowledge and understanding. The perfection of man is his call to the Supreme Enlightenment of the Buddha, who passes not away, but has life for evermore, and becomes a blessing to all men. It is strange, is it not, that if my conjecture as to the date of this book is true, a Christian Apostle should almost simultaneously have been telling the world that the Incarnation of the Ever-

existing Word had taken place in order that He might give Life, Eternal Life, and more abundant Life; that this Life consisted in Perfect Enlightenment, in knowing God and His Son; and that the end before mankind was to become the "Sons of God"? There is not much difference in conception between a "Son of God" and a Buddha.

We shall not quarrel with the author of the *Saddharma Pundarika* for thinking that a new era had dawned for Buddhism with the date of this great announcement. All great Aeons or ages have been marked by a "Revolution of the Wheel of the Law," by some new Truth entrusted to mankind, as a whole or in part, to enable it to make some great step forward; and it is man's Wisdom to see the Wheel turning and to seize the truth which is at such times brought home to his consciousness. The call of Abraham marked an Aeon, the Exodus another, the Babylonian Exile a third. The "Shaking of the Nations" which accompanied that Exile, the wonderful centuries which gave birth to Chinese, Greek, and Indian philosophy, to say nothing of Sakyamuni's teachings, may surely be reckoned as one of the World's greatest Aeons. The author of the *Saddharma Pundarika* lived apparently about the beginning of another, for even a non-Christian or an anti-Christian would find it difficult to deny that the first century A.D. marks one of the most important crises of human history.

Strange to say, the East seems to have been conscious that the dawn of the new era was connected with the appearance or manifestation of

some Person, Human or Divine, round whom centred all the religious feeling of the age.

The Visit of the Magi, and the inquiry of the Greeks at the Feast (who may have been Asiatic Greeks), comprise nearly all that our records tell us of the longings of the heathen world for Christ. In Buddhist records there is a great deal more. The Tibetan books tell us that Kanishka, the Scythian Conqueror of N.W. India, was converted from the fierce barbarism of a savage to the gentler manners of a saint by an aged ṛishi or saint (possibly one of the Magi) who met with him as he walked and discoursed of righteousness and the law. Kanishka's friend and religious ally was the celebrated As'vaghosha, the poet and philosopher, the father of the Mahāyāna. There are ancient Chinese books which assert that during his lifetime Sakyamuni appeared again upon earth. Kanishka's date is generally given between B.C. 8 and A.D. 40, and As'vaghosha's at the same period. The Kashmirian History tells us that Nāgārjūna, the great Saint of the Mahāyāna Buddhism, lived one hundred and fifty years after the Buddha Sakyasiṃha.[1] He actually did live about one hundred and fifty years after the death of Christ, and the *Saddharma Pundarika*, composed, as we have already seen, in the early years of our Christian era, speaks of Sakyasiṃha (the "Lion of the Tribe of the Sakyas") as the "present Buddha." (*Saddh.* p. 28.)

I pass over non-canonical Christian evidence, though I am far from rejecting the testimony of

[1] See Klaproth, *Mémoires relatifs à l'Asie*, vol. ii.

the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Thomas, which makes that Apostle to have preached Christ to the Indo-Parthian King Gondophares, a perfectly historical personage. I am at the present moment collecting heathen testimonies to the consciousness of the Eastern World of the import and importance of the great religious crisis. Very early in the first century A.D., a rumour spread among the people of North China to the effect that the Queen of the Western Heaven had given birth to a Divine Son, and it was only with great difficulty that the people were prevented from migrating westwards in shoals to worship at the cradle of Him that had been born. There is nothing impossible in the story. China, at the dawn of the Christian era, was a great military power, and her armies penetrated as far as the Caspian Sea. Returning soldiers may easily have heard of the Birth of Christ, and have brought the news back to their Eastern homes.

It is, at any rate, very difficult not to connect this story with the one which is told of the introduction of Buddhism into China. In the year A.D. 64, the Emperor Ming-ti had a dream which was interpreted to mean that a great Teacher had been born in the West, and that he had better send to inquire. Buddhism was already in many portions of his dominions, there was no need to send West for that. Still he sent, possibly to satisfy the excited populace, and he got the Buddhism of Central India, not yet quickened by the zeal engendered by the Great Council of Kanishka, at which the leading spirit was As'vaghosha, of whom

it was said that Sakyamuni had reappeared during his lifetime. One book remains of the five said to have been brought to China by those earliest apostles of a Buddhism not yet quickened by the light of the New Era that had just dawned—the so-called Sutra of the Forty-two Sections. It bears to Buddhism something of the same relation that the Sermon on the Mount bears to the Christian Faith. It sums up all that is past; it reviews that which former ages had given, and so forms a basis or starting-point for further progress and development. The two pioneers of official Buddhism in China both died within three or four years of their arrival. Then followed a long interval of seventy years (A.D. 70-140) before other missionaries came. The next batch were led by men from Central Asia, and not from India proper, and the Buddhism they brought was already deeply tinged with the thought of the new era of which the *Saddharma Pundarika* speaks.

Tennyson tells us of the "increasing purpose" of the ages. Abraham, Moses, the Prophets of the Captivity, each marks the commencement of a larger hope and a more widely embracing teaching. The same may be said of the different ages in the spiritual life of India. The teachings which Sakyamuni supplanted were narrower in every way than that which he inaugurated, and from age to age the circle of Indian thought extended itself over a wider range of intellectual activity and local area. The great Era which began with the Birth of Christ produced results in two directions. The Christianity that we know worked westward until

it embraced all Europe and absorbed all that there was of religious thought in the West. Almost at the same moment, the reformed Buddhism of the Mahāyāna started eastward, and, spreading itself over Asia, absorbed all that there was of religious thought in Central Asia, China, and Japan. Each has had an influence outside of its own sphere. If Christianity had not been, there would never have been Mahometanism, and in the same way Hindooism, Confucianism, and Japanese Shinto have been profoundly influenced by Buddhism.

To-day the East and the West have met, and everybody is saying that we are witnessing the Birth of a New Era, with an increasing purpose, a wider outlook, and a more glorious message. And if to-day there are strange portents and signs in the spiritual world, may it not be that the Lord, Whom, in different ways, Mahometan and Hindoo, Buddhist and Christian, alike worship and revere, is about to give a new exposition of old Truths which He is desirous that all the world should hear ?

CHAPTER X

SERMONS FROM BUDDHIST TEXTS (3)

"To elucidate this matter more at large, I will tell thee a parable: for men of good understanding will generally readily enough catch the meaning of what is taught under the shape of a parable."—*Saddharma Pundarika*, iii. p. 73.

THE *Saddharma Pundarika* is full of parables, nearly all of which are echoes, as it were, of parables and sayings which meet us in the New Testament. In each such case, the Gospel version is a simple one, while the version presented to us in the Buddhist book is elaborated and expanded, and is indeed sometimes used to point a different moral from that of a similar saying from Christ or His Apostles. As a general rule it is the short, pithy saying that bears the most distinct marks of originality: expansion and elaboration must evidently be later than the solid kernel of simple statement, and it is the expander rather than the condenser that is, as a rule, the plagiarist. At the same time, there is no need to affirm that there must have been a definite contact between the Christian writers and the composer of this Buddhist

Apocalypse. Fire, rain, sunshine, sickness are subjects about which any nation can make up obvious parables, without being obliged to borrow from the literature of other nations, and it is only when these minute points of resemblance become very numerous that the thought of borrowing forces itself upon the mind.

The first parable which I shall treat of reads like an expansion of St. Jude's words (which I quote from the Authorised Version): "of some have compassion, making a difference; and others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire."

The Tathāgata, in chapter iii. of the *Hokekyō* (how much shorter the name is in Japanese than in Sanskrit!), expounds a parable of a burning house. It is a large, roomy house, in which a band of boys are playing innocently, and without a thought of danger. The father comes home to find the house on fire, and that he has but a very few moments in which to save them. To raise a sudden alarm of fire would mean to cause a disastrous panic, such as even we of the twentieth century have witnessed: the only hope of rescue lies in coaxing the silly children from the burning house by some plausible excuse. So the father goes to them. "Run out into the garden," he says, "and you will there find the handsome presents I have brought you, presents to suit all your tastes, deer-carts, goat-carts, bullock-carts, whichever you like." The children run out to get the promised presents; when they reach the garden they find that all have received the same presents—but the best ones—"bullock-carts only,

made of seven precious substances." Such is the mercy of the Tathāgata: he sees mankind living as it were in a burning house, but heedless of their danger (who, for instance, would nowadays say that he made profession of Christianity "to save himself from the wrath to come"?); he sees them with different temperaments and varying attainments and needs, and he suits his teaching to the wants of his children. He would not, for instance, dream of applying to Japanese wants all that experience had found good for an English congregation, or expect from a Mongolian the same rubrical accuracy that he looked for in a London curate. He knows how to "make a difference," and he has different "vehicles" for the conveyance of his teachings. There are some, says the *Hokekyō*,[1] "who wish to follow the dictates of an authoritative voice"; there are others "desirous of self-restraint and tranquillity," who wish "to understand causes and effects for the sake of *their own* complete Nirvana." Buddhism calls such people "Pratyeka Buddhas," private or "pocket" Saints—they are the people who, when Christians, like to attend musical services in well-arranged Churches, with eloquent preachers; but have no care for the welfare of others. And there are others, again, who desire the knowledge and "freedom from hesitation" of the Tathāgata (for Buddhism likewise holds that the "truth can make us free"), not for themselves, but for the "benefit, weal, and happiness of the world at large." Their desire is to "spend and be spent" in the service of

[1] *Saddh.* chap. iii. p. 80.

God. Buddhism speaks of them as "Bodhisattva Mahasattvas." These men are the true sons of God. It does not yet appear what they shall be; but when He shall appear they shall be like Him, for they shall see Him as He is. But whichever Vehicle it be, the authoritative voice, or the cultured religion, or the life of service, the end is the same. The labourers in the Vineyard all got their pennies, and there is but one end before us, whether we call it Salvation, or Enlightenment, or Eternal Life.

The second parable[1] is one of "a certain man" who "went away from his father and betook himself to some other place." The father was very wealthy, but he has no heir, and is constantly mourning for the son whom he has lost. The son sinks lower and lower in the far country to which he has betaken himself, and in process of time quite forgets his exalted origin.

The parable resembles our own Christian parable of the Prodigal Son, but with a striking difference. Christ's parable was spoken to Jews who, though far alienated from God, had never forgotten whose sons they were. Christ's prodigal, therefore, carried with him into his exile that fund of saving knowledge which enabled him, when the husks failed him, to remember his father's house, and return to be forgiven. And, being a son, with the knowledge that he was a son, *and penitent*, he could be restored at once.

But when God set Himself to work to show His light and truth to the Gentiles, He was dealing

[1] *Saddh.* chap. iv. p. 99.

with nations which, like the prodigal in the Buddhist parable, had forgotten their divine parentage. That knowledge had to be revived in them; they had to be servants before they knew themselves to be sons, and it was only after a lengthy and carefully watched probation that the returned wanderer could be acknowledged as the Son and the Heir. We are apt to forget this difference in the circumstances of the non-Christian nations and ourselves. And yet, as we, "who once were Gentiles," look back upon the history of God's dealings with us during the long Christian centuries, it has only been by little and little that we have been moved upwards in the grades of God's household, whilst other nations, as *e.g.* Japan, which I know better than I know England, have likewise been led step by step, and promoted as they have been found faithful.

Every person familiar with the Bible will recognise the following parables, to which I have already alluded elsewhere. The grace of the Tathāgata is compared to the rain, which falls on hills and valleys, and fertilises all manner of plants and grasses. The soil of every field is the same, and the essence of the rain is the same, and yet each plant, according to its need, sucks out of the rain the peculiar nourishment it requires. This is a familiar parable with a new application.[1]

"And further, Kasyapa," says Sakyamuni, addressing his senior disciple, "the Tathāgata in his educating creatures is impartial and not partial. As the light of the sun and moon shines upon all

[1] *Saddh.* chap. v. p. 119, etc.

the world, upon the virtuous and the wicked, upon high and low, upon the fragrant and the ill-smelling; as their beams are sent down upon everything equally, without partiality; so too the intellectual light of the knowledge of the Omniscient . . . proceeds equally in respect to all beings." [1]

Or again, "It is as if a potter made different vessels out of the same clay. Some of those pots are to contain sugar, others ghee, others curds and milk; others, of inferior quality, are vessels of impurity. There is no diversity in the clay used (no real distinction between Brahman or pariah, between Pharisee and publican, between Jew and Gentile, between Anglo-Saxon and Mongolian): the diversity of the pots is only due to the substances which are put into each of them." [2]

We next seem to get an echo of Christ as the opener of the blind eyes. It is the parable of the blind-born and the physician who knows all diseases. The blind-born refuses to believe in the existence of things which he has never seen, as sun, moon, and stars: the physician feels compassion for the blind-born man, and rests not until he has procured for his patient some potent herbs from the Himalaya mountains. The patient's eyes are opened and he sees how foolish he was in his blind want of belief.

But now that he begins to see, he falls into the sin of presumption. He thinks that he knows everything, and does not understand how very limited, after all, is human vision and the

[1] *Saddh.* p. 128. [2] *Ibid.* p. 129.

strength of man. There is a further wisdom still to be acquired, and until he has made that his own he can scarcely be said to see.

There is always, a little ahead of us, some further stage of unacquired holiness or knowledge as a stimulus for our exertion. We can never say that we have attained : the prize of our high calling is always before us. We can never say "here is our rest" ; the ultimate haven of rest is always in the future.

A great company of travellers on their way to the Isle of Jewels have reached a dense forest, which alarms them by its extent and the horrors of its dark mysteries, so that weary and footsore they desire to return. Their guide, "a man of able devices," deems it a great pity that "these poor people should not reach that great Isle of Jewels," and, moved by compassion, produces in the midst of the forest a magic city to which he leads them. "We have reached our rest," say the travellers ; but presently the magic city disappears, and they find that their journey is not yet over. They are disappointed, but the rest has done them good, and they are able to march on, refreshed and comforted. The passage of the Red Sea secured Israel from the pursuit of the Egyptians, but Sinai was not their rest, nor yet the Land of Promise. The Church of Christ has its great achievements always in front of it : the New Testament closes with the Heavenly City "descending out of Heaven from God" ; but beyond that there seems to be a vista of infinite possibilities, and an immensity of hope not yet

revealed. So boundless in all ways is the grace of God towards us; and yet some of us may be compared to the miserable beggar-man of the *Hokekyō*, sitting starving by the wayside in entire ignorance of the precious gem which our spiritual friend has bound within the folds of our garment.

One more parable remains to be noticed. It is the parable of the King and his Crown Jewel, which has many points of similarity to Christian thought.

"It is a case, Manjusri, similar to that of a king, a ruler of armies, who by force has conquered his own kingdom (did not Christ do that in His great conflict?), *whereupon other kings, his adversaries, wage war against him.* That ruler of armies has soldiers of various descriptions to fight with various enemies. As the king sees those soldiers fighting, he is delighted with their gallantry, and makes to his soldiers several donations. . . . But to none he makes a present of his Crown Jewel, because that jewel only fits on the head of a king."[1] Yet at last, when he sees that the victory has been gained, he no longer restrains his delight, but gives to the victorious armies his most precious diadem, the Crown Jewel. So God's gift of salvation, which at first is but a deliverance from pain, or a fleeing from the wrath to come, ends in being something much higher, the Crown Jewel in Christ's diadem, the gift of eternal life, given to those who continue the fight after Christ has conquered "His own kingdom."

[1] *Saddh.* chap. xiii. p. 274, etc.

I have dwelt at some length on the parables in the *Saddharma Pundarika*, because they are not only capable of a Christian interpretation, but are so constantly similar to Christian parables and phrases that it is hard to suppose that there has been no connection in the mind of the writer. I have in another chapter mentioned my belief that this book, so strangely Christian in other points as well as its imagery, was inspired by Alexandrian thought and lay at the basis of the Manichaean heresy.

I do not close my eyes to the fact that there are other portions which are not fitted for the use of Christian propagandism. There are chapters, for instance, on spells and wonders, which were evidently never meant for literal acceptance. But the Japanese Buddhism of to-day, while retaining its reverence for this book which has been so intimately interwoven with its own history, exhibits a marked tendency to lay the miraculous on one side, and to put a distinct and decided emphasis on the moral teachings. Every new book that the Japanese Buddhists put out now (and their literary activity is very great) gives clear proof of this tendency.

When Apostolic Christianity (to say nothing of Christ Himself) was asked for a proof of Divine Mission, the answer was "Search the Scriptures," and the witness of the Old Testament to Christ has always been the Church's weapon of attack and defence against the Jew. I believe we may use the same weapon in our warfare for Christ in Buddhist lands. We too can say, and if we can

surely we ought to say so, "Search your Buddhist Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of Christ." It is a new way of presentation, I admit, but a thing is not necessarily bad, nor even Modernist, because it is new. But what a Gospel it will be to the Buddhist world to tell it of the priceless jewel which it has all these years been carrying stitched up in the lining of its garment. God grant that it may prove a powerful instrument of Truth.

CHAPTER XI

WHAT DID THE GREEK FATHERS KNOW ABOUT GREAT VEHICLE BUDDHISM?

It would be easy for me to multiply instances of the echoes of New Testament teaching to be found in the *Saddharma Pundarika* Scripture. I might dwell, for instance, on the Transfiguration Scene in which Sakyamuni, talking, as did Jesus, with his forerunners, is transfigured in the presence of his disciples. Or I could expand the theme of the Real Presence, as contained in the vision of the Stūpa already referred to. Or I might speak of Sakyamuni's commission to his preachers whom he sends forth as sheep amidst wolves to preach an unpopular Gospel to hostile ears. Or, again, I might draw out the parallels between the Four Living Creatures of the Apocalypse, and the Four Mahāsattvas of the *Saddharma Pundarika*; between the Apocalyptic account of the Resurrection, and the corresponding Issuing of countless Bodhisattvas from the gaps of the Earth, in the Buddhist work.

If my readers will kindly remember the circumstances under which I am writing, with, as it

were, a necessity laid upon me of restating my case in an unavoidably brief period of time, they will pardon me for not working these things out in detail. They will also pardon me if in the present chapter I content myself with references to one book of one author only, for the establishment of my main thesis that the ancient Greek Fathers knew about Mahāyāna and One Vehicle Buddhism, and that some of them, at least, understood that the central Personage in the miscellaneous group of heresies with which they had to deal on the Eastern confines of the Roman Empire was a Being consciously copied (Origen would say "parodied") from the Christ of the Christian world.

The author I take is Origen. Born at Alexandria, A.D. 185 or 186, the pupil of Pantaenus and Clement, he died at Caesarea about A.D. 254. Alexandria contained at the time a large and flourishing Indian colony, composed mainly of merchants (Buddhism has always been a merchant's religion), and there was interchange of thoughts as well as of commodities between Egypt and India. Clement of Alexandria, one of Origen's teachers, was acquainted with Buddhism, for he speaks of Buddha, and uses the word *Stūpa*, which is a very distinctively Indian expression. Pantaenus, his other teacher, resigned the Headship of the Catechetical School in Alexandria in order to become a missionary to India, from which country he brought back with him a MS. copy of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. One of Origen's most interesting works is his treatise

Adversus Haereses.[1] I read it many years ago, with unopened eyes, and found it dull and unprofitable. I read it again last year with my eyes opened to the true "inwardness" of Japanese Buddhism, and I saw before me a living picture of the religious systems in the midst of which I dwell.

I purposely say "systems," for that which Origen says of Gnosticism is absolutely and literally true also of Japanese Buddhism, which, I take it, embraces all that is highest, best, and most fully developed in the whole range of Northern Buddhism. It is not one system, but a group of many systems, sometimes even of contradictory systems. The only thing which bound the Gnostics of the various schools together was that all their various opinions and speculations grouped themselves around the person of Jesus Christ as the highest emanation from *bythos* or *chaos.* In the same way, the only thing that binds together the various and conflicting schools of Japanese Buddhism is that, in spite of differences and divergences, they all centre in Sakyamuni as an emanation, practically the highest, from the unformed Divine Essence.

Further, the Jesus of the Gnostics was not the Jesus of the Gospels, absolutely Very Man, tempted in all points like as we are, yet sinless. Similarly, the Sakyamuni of the *Saddharma Pun-*

[1] I quote this book as Origen's, though I am fully aware of the fact that it is by most scholars assigned to Hippolytus. I believe there is still something to be said in favour of assigning it to Origen, but this is a difficult question, outside of my present scope, so that I do not feel it necessary to enter into it.

darika is not the historical Buddha, the loving, humorous, genial, human teacher, full of irony and subtle wit, and yet never forgetful of his Mission to his countrymen. There is a family resemblance between the Jesus of the Gnostics and the glorified Sakyamuni of the later Buddhism which is so striking as to be more than a coincidence. It is impossible not to feel that Mahāyānism and Gnosticism really form one family, and that the head of the household is one and the same Person, spoken of as Sakyamuni in the East, as Christ in the West, and providing spiritual food for his household by allegorised interpretations of the Bible, the Greek Philosophers, the Brahmin and Buddhist sages, according to the varying exigencies of time and place.

But it is time that I began to particularise. I have drawn my materials from Origen, *Adv. Haereses*, books v. to x., which contain notices of the semi-oriental sects of Gnostics with which Origen had come into contact. Some of these sects traced their beginnings to the foundation period of Christianity, some even to the Apostles, as, *e.g.*, the Naassenes who claimed to hold what Matthias had taught. Of all of them we may say that the systems which were in full vigour when Origen was writing (say A.D. 230) must have come into existence some years before his time, so that they may all be looked upon as being certainly products of the second Christian century.

In book v. Origen gives a description of the Naassenes, whom he places before Simon Magus, perhaps as representing an earlier phase of heresy.

The Naassenes were worshippers of the serpent (Hebrew *Nahash*, but in Sanskrit also *Nāga*), and are therefore sometimes called Ophites. They spoke of three Worlds—*νοερόν*, *ψυχικόν*, *χοϊκόν*—and of One Divine Being pervading the three Worlds, and partaking of a threefold Nature. This Divine Being is spoken of as the Father, but He is also Himself the Son, for there proceeds from Him an emanation, which is His own spiritual Son. Put that into the language of the Amida Buddhists of whom I have spoken in a previous chapter.[1] There is a Threefold World—the World of Desire, which is material; of Form, which is appreciable by the intellect; and the Formless World, which lies beyond the region of thought and speech. Amitābha, exalted by the Shinshū to the Supreme place, is the Father, and is constantly so described in the books that speak of His Vow. But He that is Father also is Son, for there proceeded from Him His Dhyāni Bodhisattva, Avalokitesvara, Kwannon, the spiritual embodiment of Divine Love and Compassion, whose work it is to save and help mankind, by all arts and devices of Love.

Origen then goes on to give us a Naassene hymn. In true Buddhist language, this hymn describes the condition of the Universe, whose first law of existence is the *Mind*, and which may be described as a kaleidoscopic wheel of constant change and misery into which the human soul enters as into a labyrinth from which it is an almost hopeless task to try to procure extrication.

[1] Chap. VI., Tendai and Shinshū.

"Then said Jesus: See, Father, the restless desire of evils which is upon the earth from thy breath. It seeks to escape from the bitter chaos, but shows not how to pass through it. Therefore, send Me, Father; I will descend bearing the seals, I will pass through whole ages, I will open up all mysteries, I will show the forms of gods, I will hand to them the secrets of the holy path, under the name of *Gnōsis*."[1]

Here, *mutatis tantum nominibus*, we have Amitābha's Vow, Avalokitesvara's Incarnations, the long ages through which Amitābha was acquiring the merits by which He obtained the fulfilment of His Vow, the *seals* placed in the possession of the initiate,[2] and the ultimate deliverance from the labyrinth of this confused mundane existence. It is not without significance that the *Nāgas*, or Serpent-worshipping Tribes, play a considerable part among the theatrical accessories of every Mahāyāna Sutra; that names like Nāgārjūna, Nāgasena, etc., point to an actual connection of Buddhism with the Serpent Tribes; that the snake, or dragon, is the emblem of China, and engraved on the coinage of Japan; and that paper serpents are used in the funeral rites of certain Buddhist sects in Japan to-day.

Origen next goes on to describe the Peratae,[3] whose subtle and insidious teachings about Christ had, he says, only just been exposed. Like the Naassenes and the Buddhists, the Peratae postulate

[1] Orig. *Adv. Haeres.* v. § 10, pp. 175-6 (in Migne's *Patrology*).
[2] See Chap. IV. Kōbō and Manichaeism.
[3] Orig. *l.c.* v. 12, pp. 176-7.

a Threefold World, and a threefold principle—the perfect good, which is unborn and ineffable, the derivative good, which contains in itself infinite possibilities of multiplication, and the special or individual good. There are thus three Worlds, and three Impersonal Goods : if each of the three Goods be applied to the three Worlds, the result is "nine Goods." The Peratae said there were three Fathers, three Sons, three Holy Ghosts ; there are certain temples in Japan in which Amitābha is worshipped as *Ku-hon-butsu*, the "Ninefold Buddha," and the soul of the believer in its passage through the threefold divisions of the threefold world obtains a ninefold revelation of the mercies of Amitābha. Again, as in the *Saddharma Pundarika*, we find in Peratism a division of the Universe into many sections ("Buddha-fields"), each with its own presiding deity and its own teachings and thoughts, all of which, though differing in outward expression, are in essence One. All this is pure Mahāyāna Buddhism. If we remember that there is a Buddhist tradition that Sakyamuni appeared on earth again in the days of As'vaghosha, we shall not be surprised to find the Peratae making this further application of Buddhist doctrines to Christian revelation. In the days of Herod, they said, there descended from above, from the Ineffable and Indescribable World, which is absolutely unconditioned, a certain Person with three natures, three bodies, and three powers, named Christ. And the reason for His *thus coming* ("Tathāgata," the "thus come") was that He might descend to the lowest and so rise up

again to bring salvation to all. In this Person were united all the elements of all the worlds. He was the *pleroma* of the Godhead in a bodily form. Even trees and stones, says Nichiren, the great expounder of the *Saddharma Pundarika*, have in them the potentialities of salvation, and Sakyamuni, the Lord with the Three Bodies, appearing in the Threefold Universe, comprises in himself all that is in the Universe, divine or human. *Manjusri*, *Yakushi*, *Fugen*, even the great Amitābha himself, are but partial manifestations of the Eternal Sakyamuni who descended on earth and revealed the One Vehicle. It is perhaps interesting to note further that the Peratae made much use of the signs of the Zodiac (*l.c.* pp. 178-184), that they had guardian deities of the four quarters whom they spoke of as *proastii*, that the quotation from their books which Origen gives reads very much like one of the fanciful pedigrees of imaginary Tathāgatas in one of the Mahāyāna Sutras, that they had a secret tradition[1] conveyed without words, like the Buddhists, and that they called themselves Peratae, because they possessed the one vehicle by which to pass safely and infallibly to salvation.[2]

The whole of Origen's description of the Naassenes and Peratae is deserving of a very careful and detailed study by some scholar thoroughly conversant with the Mahāyānist systems. My present limits will not allow of my doing so; for I must pass on to what Origen has to say of

[1] *ἄρρητα ἀλαλῶς παραδιδόμενα μυστήρια*, pp. 198-9.

[2] *μόνοι δέ, φησίν, ἡμεῖς οἱ τὴν ἀνάγκην τῆς γενέσεως ἐγνωκότες καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς δι' ὧν εἰσελήλυθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἀκριβῶς δεδιδαγμένοι διελθεῖν καὶ περᾶσαι τὴν φθορὰν μόνοι δυνάμεθα*, pp. 188-9.

other Gnostic teachings which bear distinct traces of Buddhism. Basilides of Alexandria has been claimed as a Buddhist; his teaching of the contrast between Being and non-Being runs very parallel to the prevalent trend of Buddhist thought in the days of Nāgājūna, and the Fathers of Mahāyāna philosophy, from the end of the second century A.D. to the end of the third, and I have found in a Shingon treatise the name (Abraxas) of the ineffable God whom Basilides described as the "non-Being God who created a non-Being world, with non-Being materials" (*ὁ οὐκ ὢν θεὸς ἐποίησε κόσμον οὐκ ὄντα ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων, Adv. Haer.* vii. pp. 358-9).[1] Carpocrates was another Alexandrian Gnostic of the second century, in whom we find traces of Buddhist philosophy. Carpocrates taught that the gods, whether Christian or heathen, by whom the worlds had been made, were, as being merely *κοσμοποιοὶ ἄρχοντες*, inferior to the truly enlightened man, such as Christ. Christ, they said, had become conscious of His superiority, and it was this consciousness that enabled Him to triumph. But Christ's triumph was not His alone: any soul that gains this consciousness of superiority may triumph as Christ did—nay, if the consciousness be greater than Christ's, the triumph may also be greater, and the glory attained higher and more complete.[2]

[1] My authority is volume iii. of *Bukkyō Gimon Raitō Shū*, p. 504, etc., a book containing many most interesting articles on Buddhist philosophy and theology, to which I am indebted for much valuable information. It is a rare book, though only published some twenty years ago, and I have only been able to procure volumes i. and iii.

[2] *Adv. Haer.* vii. 401-2.

Buddhism teaches a tenfold gradation of sentient life; at the bottom of the scale are the Hells, the Hungry Devils, the Fierce Devils, the Brutes; Man and the Celestial Beings occupy the middle rungs of the ladder; the four highest are for those in whom the consciousness of superiority has begun to dawn, the disciples, the Pratyeka Buddhas, the Bodhisattvas, and, above all, the Buddhas. And there are Buddhist sects which maintain that Beings such as Amitābha and Vairocana have attained to greater heights even than Sakyamuni himself. The next instance I shall quote would be open to the charge of fancifulness did it stand alone; but when the evidences of an acquaintance with Mahāyāna doctrines are so many and so striking, one may perhaps be allowed to mention the following coincidence without laying too much stress upon it.

It is generally the Buddhist custom in translating Buddhist Scriptures into foreign languages to translate proper names rather than transcribe them. Thus As'vaghosha becomes Memyō, and Nāgārjūna, Ryūjū, etc. etc., and there are very few names indeed which have escaped the translator's eye or defied his skill. We may justly infer, therefore, from the analogies of Chinese, Tibetan, Mongolian, and Japanese, that a Buddhist presenting his Creed to a person acquainted with Hebrew or Greek, would try to find Hebrew or Greek equivalents for the proper names employed.

In Book vii. pp. 407-9, of the *Adversus Haereses*, Origen introduces us to a Gnostic of the name of Theodotus who laid especial emphasis

on the Person and Work of Melchizedek, who is represented as greater than Christ, because the latter is but a reproduction of a Saint that had been before Him. Put Melchizedek into Sanskrit, and it is the *Dharmarāja*; and on p. 122 of the English translation of the *Saddharma Pundarika*, Sakyamuni speaks of himself: "I am the Dharmarāja, born in the world as the destroyer of existence. I declare the law to all beings after discriminating their dispositions." But this is not a point that needs to be pressed.

My last instance is taken from the teachings of a certain Alcibiades,[1] who brought to Rome from Syria in the third year of Trajan a book said to have miraculously come into the possession of a just man named Elchesai, who got it from the town of Serae in Parthia. The traditions of the "gigantic Buddha" are still common in Far Eastern Buddhism. Japan has its *Diabutsu* at Nara and Kamakura, undoubtedly inspired by the Colossus at Bamian in Afghanistan and other similar images, and Abbot Kobayashi, in his *Doctrines of Nichiren*, takes the trouble to clear his Nichirenist brethren of the charge of imagining the Sakyamuni they worship to be a Colossus. The allusion to Trajan gives us a strange time-coincidence. Buddhism was introduced into China first in A.D. 67 by two Indian priests, who died in a very few years. Then came a long interval of seventy years (amply accounted for in Chinese history), at the end of which a second party of Buddhist monks arrived at Lōyang, which was then the capital of the Han

[1] Origen, *Adv. Haer.* ix. pp. 462-3.

Emperors. The party, which arrived in A.D. 148, was headed by a Parthian Prince of the name of Anshikâo, who was the nephew apparently (or son) of Trajan's enemy Chosroes, and whose aunt resided at Rome as a hostage for several years until released by Hadrian. Alcibiades is described by Origen as the contemporary of Callistus at Rome, and we have therefore one more ray of light thrown on the celebrated conflict between Callistus the Pope and Hippolytus the theologian!

This Alcibiades is said by Origen to have taught that Christ was a true man,[1] that the Birth at Bethlehem was not His first birth from a Virgin, that He had been born before, and more than once, under many forms and shapes. He said, moreover, that the book which he brought with him to Rome had come to him from a town called Serae Parthorum, through the hands of two persons, Sobiai and Elchesai, the latter of whom had received it from an Angel of Colossal Stature. Now let us remember that the Greeks and Romans called the Chinese *Seres*, and that therefore the town Serae Parthorum would be probably found on the confines of the Parthian Empire and the Chinese, which in Trajan's time had been extended, by the victories of Panchao, as far as the Caspian Sea. The frontier line between China and Parthia would run probably

[1] *Adv. Haer.* ix. 464-5. *τὸν Χριστὸν δὲ λέγει ἄνθρωπον κοινῶς πᾶσι γεγονέναι, τοῦτον δὲ οὐ νῦν πρώτως ἐκ Παρθένου γεγεννῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρότερον, καὶ αὖθις πολλάκις γεννηθέντα καὶ γεννώμενον πεφηνέναι καὶ φύεσθαι, ἀλλάσσοντα γενέσεις καὶ μετενσωματούμενον.* Possibly the first clause should be translated, "He said that Christ, *qua* man, was born as others are."

along the mountain-ridges to the North of Afghanistan. And there, to this day, stands the Colossal Angel, hewn out of the living rock on the heights of Bamian, not far from Kabul,—the statue which the Chinese call *Milie Pusa*, Maitreya, the Buddha that was to come! Three centuries after Trajan's time a Chinese traveller visited India, and in the record of his journeys he tells us that the Buddhists erected this Statue at some important crisis of their history, and having erected it, crossed over the frontier of the kingdom, and went forth to preach their Gospel. The event of which Fa-hian speaks cannot have been connected with the death of Sakyamuni, for it was the Greeks apparently that brought sculpture into India, nor with the Council of As'oka, of which Northern Buddhism knows nothing. It must have been the Council held at Peshawar under Kanishka in the middle of the first century A.D. The Council itself must have taken some time, as there was a lengthy commentary or Abhidarma to be composed; the hewing out of the great Colossus on the Bamian slopes must have occupied some more. The first Christian century would almost be over before the monks would be ready to start, and, according to Origen, it was in the third year of Trajan (A.D. 101) that the new Revelation was given which, according to Alcibiades, was to supersede the Gospel of Christ.

As I have said before, there was residing in Rome a few years after this supposed revelation was given, a Parthian Princess, the sister of Chosroes, sent to Rome as a hostage for her brother.

What more likely than that such a lady should bring with her, amongst her train, some persons with a knowledge of the new Revelation? It is more than possible that she was herself a believer in it. Her brother Chosroes died shortly after the accession of Hadrian in A.D. 117, and was succeeded, not by a son, apparently, but by a brother. And yet, if the Chinese records are to be believed, he had a son. For the Chinese records tell us that Anshikâo, the head of the second Buddhist Mission, was a Parthian Prince who had resigned his throne in favour of his uncle and become a Buddhist priest. This uncle must have been Chosroes (A.D. 108-130), a younger brother of Pachōrus (78-108). It cannot have been the successor of Chosroes, Vologesus II., for that sovereign was no kinsman of his predecessors, and his successor, Vologesus III., did not come to the throne till 148, which would hardly give Anshikâo time to arrive at Lōyang, after all the formalities of abdication, in the course of the same year. Anshikâo was a most voluminous translator; it must have taken years of toil before he was fit to enter upon his work as the head of a mission to China. I take it, therefore, that Anshikâo was the son of Pachōrus, left an infant at his father's death and brought up by his uncle Chosroes, that he resigned his kingdom to his uncle, and after due preparation became a Buddhist priest and went out to China.[1]

[1] Another possibility presents itself. Anshikâo may have been the son of one of the numerous pretenders that troubled Parthia, both under Chosroes and under Vologesus. It is my impression, however, gathered from Oncken's *Weltgeschichte* and other sources,

The book which heads the list of Anshikâo's works in Dr. Nanjo's Catalogue of the Chinese Tripitaka is a Sutra on Maitreya, the Buddha to come, whose Colossal Statue adorns the heights above Bamian. It has never yet been translated into English, but his companion, Lokaraksha, appears in the same Catalogue as the translator of one of the Amitābha books of which I have already spoken so often. This book—one of the Sukhāvati Vyūhas—has been published in English in the *Sacred Books of the East* Series. I will invite my readers to turn to Origen, and see what he says about the teachings of Callistus, the Callistians, and Alcibiades, in the book *Adversus Haereses*, and then to read carefully the Amida Sutras in the *Sacred Books of the East* Series, or even the *Saddharma Pundarika* Sutra. I am sure that they will be much surprised by the similarities in doctrine between the two.[1] It is true that the Sutra says nothing about Baptism, whereas Origen emphasises the fact of a new Baptism which was preached by the followers of this new teaching. But Buddhism has its Baptism too, though it is not much in use now. As late as December of last year, I was visiting the Temple of Dainichi at Kawasaki and bought for a trifle a tract which spoke very earnestly about the advantages of this Buddhist Baptism, which now survives

that most of these pretenders were either brothers, cousins, or nephews, so that the connection between Anshikâo and the Parthian Princess would be still maintained. There were many Buddhists in Parthia, especially in the eastern provinces, and the Parthian Sovereigns were extremely tolerant in matters of religion.

[1] See also my note at the end of Chap. VI.

only sporadically, but was once the universal rule of the undivided Mahāyāna Church.[1]

The information which I have been able to discover about this unexpected connection between Buddhism and the Church in Rome makes no difference to the controversy between Hippolytus and Callistus, or to the charges which the former, and Origen (?), make against Callistus, who at the worst was probably deceived, by the plausible statements of some semi-oriental teacher, to accept as orthodox a teaching which had probably been in vogue for some time before his elevation to the See.

But the probable or even possible presence in Rome, in the very presence, as it were, of the Pope, and receiving his countenance, of the Gnostic teaching with which the Missionary Church finds itself confronted to-day, ought to throw fresh light and fresh significance upon many passages in Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse, and clear up many points in early Church history which we are apt to pass by as out of date and profitless.

[1] It is called in Sanskrit *Abhisekha*, in Japanese *Kwanjō*. The third year of Trajan (A.D. 101) falls under the Papacy of Evaristus (100-109). The next Pope, Alexander I. (109-119), is credited, by Praedestinatus, with a book against some false baptism taught in Sicily, which may possibly be meant for this one. I have not been able to verify this point. Books containing information on recondite points of Church history are not easily to be procured in Japan.

And, I should like to add, as a matter of private conviction, that, when better counsels prevail, it will be around Rome that will gather those conservative forces of Christianity which are in the end the best ones for a prolonged warfare. Hitherto we have only dreamed of such a reunion : there are some dreams from which men wake to find them true.

It ought to do more. In the face of a common danger, of insidious modes of Gnostic thought asserting themselves once more, right in the very precincts of the Sanctuary, we, Christians of all names and shades, who hold our Faith in reverence and love, shall surely find some means of drawing more closely together for the defence of that which was once given to the Saints. That Faith we shall accept, prize, study, define, expand as best we can under God's guidance. We shall try all to say the same thing, to agree on definitions and principles. It is not so important that we should all wear the same uniform: perhaps as independent regiments in the same great host we may learn to emulate one another honourably by provoking each other to greater Sacrifices of Christian Love, and to nobler deeds of the Christian daring which comes from a well-grounded Faith.

CHAPTER XII

A SCHOOL OF THE PROPHETS FOR JAPAN

[This essay was written at the close of 1906, and published in the *Catholic World* for February 1907. I republish it here in its original form, only noting that my prophecies have come true, and that the career of the Apostolic School at Urakami has abundantly justified my friend Abbé Heinrich's sagacity and forethought. Something more is, however, wanted,—a school for research, and a band of researchers who shall be at the same time convinced Christians and open-minded wide-hearted scholars. Such a school would work for all who name the Name of Christ: it would formulate what I may call the new Christian apologetics for the East, and in so doing would strengthen and confirm the Faith that amongst ourselves seems ready at times to die, and by confirming the Faith help to restore the broken Unity.]

When his present Majesty came to the throne of Japan he was still a lad in his teens. His accession had been eagerly awaited by all those who looked for a restoration of Imperial Power in this country, for it was felt on all hands that nothing could be done so long as the old Emperor lived. The almost simultaneous demise in 1867 of Emperor and Shogun, and the accession to power of two young men, opened the way for a political change which was not long in coming.

Much depended on the personal character of the new Emperor, for in spite of the peculiar sanctity which hedges round the Mikado's person, it would have been a fatal blow to the hopes and aspirations of the loyalists had he proved unequal to the burdens laid upon him by the successful movement, of which he was the centre and head, and absolute loyalty might not in such a case have been manifested to his person. The question of primogeniture was one that had frequently been discussed (in an academic way, it is true) by the Confucianist philosophers of the day. One of the loyalist leaders, Yokoi Heishiro, had, with more boldness than judgment, published a poem, in which he had derided the idea that the eldest son should always succeed. Far better, he said, choose a successor from a humble house than endanger precious interests by entrusting them to the hands of an incompetent eldest son. The poem cost Yokoi his life ; nevertheless, when the Civil War broke out, and the Shogunate was fighting for its existence, the Tokugawa adherents actually did for a while set up a rival claimant to the throne.

Much, therefore, depended on the personality of the Emperor himself, and fortunately he was a young man who could be trained and moulded by his advisers so as to fill worthily the place he was called upon to occupy.

It would be natural for the loyalist leaders, brought up in the traditions of *Bushido*, to desire that the head of the renovated State should be himself as perfect an exponent as possible of the

principles which they were all fighting to establish. It is quite a justifiable inference, therefore, that in the teachings which the young Emperor actually received we have an exemplification of the best efforts and achievements of the modernised *Bushido*.

One of the men entrusted with this most important work was Motoda Toya, a native of Kumamoto, and a friend, strange to say, of Yokoi Heishiro, whom I have just mentioned. Motoda was appointed moral lecturer (we might almost translate the phrase as court chaplain) to the Emperor in 1871, and held the office until his death in 1891. He was nominally a Confucian philosopher of the Shushi school; he was really a practical eclectic. His loyalist principles had brought him into sympathy with the Shintoist leaders, who had dug up the divine ancestry of the Imperial House out of the records of the *Kojiki*. His friendship for Yokoi had made him large-minded and tolerant, for Yokoi had dared to speak well even of the proscribed Christians. He had all the love of a Japanese for the practically useful, whilst his Confucianist studies had taught him that mere material progress was but little worth without the culture and discipline of the mind, and that there were essential elements of culture more important even than the steam-engine. "Nothing that is for the real good of the State can be displeasing to the heart of Confucius" had been the dictum of one of his philosophical predecessors. Others might give the Emperor his lessons in statecraft and the art of

war; his moral culture and training were left with confidence to the care of the single-minded Motoda.

The man's own character may be seen in the following extracts from his books in which he speaks of himself:

"In giving advice to His Majesty," he says in one place, "I have never asked the opinion of others, but have always spoken what was in my own mind, without asking myself whether the advice was acceptable or not. . . ." And again: "The way of loyalty is for a subject to give counsel to his lord in a simple and natural manner. If a man has one set of manners for the court and another for his own home, he is a deceiver. Whatever he does at court must be done with the sincerity of his usual self, and whether at home or at the court he must constantly have his lord's business in hand. . . . In giving counsel to his sovereign the subject should pay more heed to love than to reverence. . . . The boldest decisions, the most vigorous actions, the strongest and most abiding of motive-powers, will be found to abide in and to emanate from the principle of love, and the warmer the love, the better will be its results in action. . . . Love is the only thing that can move other people. . . . The greater a man's wisdom, the more comprehensive his mind. The more comprehensive a man's mind, the more complete will be his wisdom."

Motoda's lectures were collected in a volume under the title of *Kei-en Shinko Roku*, and published shortly before or after his death.

From its pages we may see how very faithful to its teachings has been the august personage for whom the lectures were intended, and how they do portray for us the best characteristics of the Japanese way of the knight. *Bushido*, as expounded by some of its professors, is a very unamiable cult, and there are some *Bushis* who can only properly be described by the slang term "bounders." But one remembers that Christianity, as expounded by some of its professors, may also be forced to wear a very unbecoming garment, and we must judge of *Bushido* as we would have others judge of Christianity, by its best and not by its worst.

"Learning," he says, and he takes the word in its Confucian sense, "is the enlightenment of a man's own nature, and the study of a man's duties, both public and private. It can best be acquired by following the great way of the golden mean which Confucius understood and practised better than any one else. The doctrine of Confucius contains the essence of learning, but the practice and acquisition of it do not limit us to the study of any one method of thought and teaching. All so-called forms of moral culture—Buddhism, for instance, or Christianity—may serve to enlarge our minds or our knowledge, but none of them is essential to the 'learning' of which Confucius spoke."

"Europeans are very proud of their civilisation, but they neglect the learning (moral culture) which is the most important of all. Hence it is that we find amongst them a constant struggle for power,

gain, and other material advantages, with a growing tendency to appeal to brute force or diplomatic deceit in their daily intercourse with one another." (Motoda lived before the days of the wars with China and Russia, and the struggle for the commercial supremacy of the Far East.) "The wisdom which the sovereign acquires must ultimately become the standard which his people will follow; it is therefore of the utmost importance that the sovereign should be well trained in the teachings of Confucius exclusively." (It must be remembered that Shintoism has no special moral teachings of its own.)

"Some people say that filial piety and brotherly love are mere private virtues, which have very little to do with national welfare and prosperity, and that steam-engines and political economy are far more potent as instruments of civilisation. Such arguments I can only meet with an emphatic 'no.' If a nation, *quâ* nation, departs from the practice of these virtues, which are the very foundations of humanity, and devotes its whole thought to the acquisition of material prosperity and nothing else, the result will be that soon no loyal subjects will be left. Why is it that the so-called civilised nations are so ready to engage in war with one another? Is it not that they value the civilisation which is material and intellectual more highly than they do that which is moral? If they had constantly attached more value to the latter than they have done to the former, there would have been no war among them. A true and solid peace, national or international, can

only be obtained by the practice of the moral virtues."[1]

Motoda is by no means the only Confucianist sage of modern times, nor is he even the most distinguished. My reason for selecting him has been that, owing to the fact of his having been chosen as one of the lecturers to the Emperor, he was typical of that peculiarly Japanese product of Confucian thought which has so much both influenced and been influenced by the native *Bushido* and the more puritanical and austere forms of Buddhism.

The true Confucianist scholar in non-Christian Japan may be said to occupy very much the position of the "prophet" or "theologian" within the Church. Living, as a rule, apart from society, in scholarly seclusion, he is a man wholly devoted to the search after truth and its elucidation when found. He is not primarily concerned with the questions of the day or hour, but is happy if he can lay bare the eternal verities which underlie the shifting sands, and which form the solid rock upon which the social fabrics reared by mankind have been made to rest. He does not seek followers, though he knows that followers will come to him in proportion to the clearness with which he enunciates the truths which he claims to have found.

But, though living apart from the world, he is

[1] The whole of this article is based on a volume of University Lectures on the Shushi Philosophy in Japan, by Professor Inouye Tetsujiro. An account of the whole book will be found in an article appearing in the 34th (1906) volume of the *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan.*

by no means indifferent to the welfare of his fellow-men, and will at times descend into the arena of daily life with some weighty word of wisdom, which exercises great influence, from the very fact that it is an appeal to first principles rather than to superficial prejudices, and endeavours to lead men to justice by means of reasonable demonstrations. When he is but a half-formed sage he has in him all the disagreeable qualities which we are apt to associate with the word "puritanic"; when he is a true sage he is ready to claim kinship with all that is "true, honest, lovely, and of good report," and will not hesitate to adopt anything that he sees to be for the real and lasting benefit of his time and nation. He is a man worth winning, and the thing which will win him is truth, stated (as it can be stated) by the "theological prophet" to whom it has been given to see deeper than other men into the eternal verities, and to explain what he has seen.

Whenever I read the books of these Japanese Confucianists I feel that they stand very much on the same ground as did Seneca, Epictetus, or Marcus Aurelius in the days when Christianity was young. I also remember that they stand just about where a Justin Martyr, an Augustine, or an Origen might have stood before they were converted from their heathen rhetoric to the service of the living and true God. And when I look at the long list of Catholic Fathers by whose writings the Church was edified and built up, and think how many of them were drawn from the ranks of the rhetoricians and philosophers, I wonder whether

the same or corresponding classes in Japan may not furnish their quota to the work of the Christian ministry in Japan. How excellent might not be the results of building into the faith of Christ Crucified the very excellent material which is already contained in some of the more spiritual of these Confucianist scholars.

Two things are certain with regard to the Christianisation of Japan, and if my readers are weary of my lucubrations on this subject I will ask them to bear with me on account of the important place which Japan is evidently destined to play in the development of Eastern Asia,—two things are certain, I say, with regard to the Christianisation of Japan—first, that *theologians* are needed above all things at the present moment, and that the theologians should be not now, but in the earliest possible future, *native Japanese*. For the present, the really competent European, acquainted with the thought of both East and West, is indispensable.

And, first, *theologians*. The seed has now been sown everywhere, and it may safely be affirmed that there is no village in Japan where the people have not heard something of Christ. There is no lack of evangelists. Neither is there any lack of men and women devoted to prayer and good works. On all sides one hears from the mouths of non-believers words of commendation for the zeal, devotion, and holy lives of *Christians* (I put the word in italics because the Japanese has a very sharp nose for detecting the difference between a believer and a worldling), and on all sides one hears

a recognition of Christ as a master among men, if not actually as the Son of God. Half Japan is now in the position of the non-believing, non-practising, nominal Christians among ourselves.

What is the reason why the Christian Faith does not commend itself to the intelligence, the spiritual intelligence, of the Japanese people more than it does? The fault cannot lie with the Author of our Faith; it must lie with ourselves. Japan does not believe Christianity because of faulty presentation. Christ has been presented to it in many fragments and with many conflicting methods, and the results have been confusion and haziness. Japan needs a real "school of the prophets," a band of theologians who shall put the Faith, in all its fulness and comprehensiveness, in such a way as to commend itself to the Japanese mind. And for this work who so fit as a well-trained, broad-minded, Catholic theologian, with large views and wide sympathies and a firm grasp of the Faith? If the Japanese rejects Christianity, it is in most cases because he has never had it properly presented to him; if, being a Christian, he is a heretic, it is for the same reason. The Catholic Faith has not been put before him in all its fulness. There is a great attractive power in clear statements of the truth, and the "prophet," as I may venture to call the theologian, has a very important part to play in the future of Japanese Christianisation.

But the theologian from America or Europe can never be the real doctor of the Japanese Church, for his theology will of necessity be of the West, western, whereas the Japanese wants a pre-

sentation of truth which shall be purely and entirely Japanese. I do not mean by this that the Faith shall be pared, pruned, or altered to suit the Japanese taste, for this is impossible to contemplate. Neither does the Japanese, properly understood, demand such a thing, for he is quite sharp enough to understand that truth is truth at all times and in all places. But he wants the truth clothed to suit his tastes, as may perhaps be more clearly seen by the use of an illustration. Let us suppose (and the supposition is, alas! not so very extravagant) a Confucianist or Buddhist mission to London. Suppose the Japanese preachers to attract many hearers, and to be surrounded after some months of labour by inquirers and catechumens asking to be instructed in the principles of the foreign faith. The Confucianist trained on Chinese books would speak to them of Confucius and Mencius, of *ri*, *ki*, and *ten*, and draw his illustrations from the wise sayings or foolish doings of men of the Tang Dynasty in China, or the Ashikaga in Japan. Would such a catechist be likely to make much impression on the minds of an inquirers' class drawn from the middle ranks of London society? He would find, would he not, that his teachings must wear an English garb before they could be acceptable to an English audience, that he must talk to them of things they understood and draw his illustrations from a history with which they were familiar? Indeed, following out our supposition, neither Confucianism nor Buddhism would ever be accepted in England until an Englishman set himself to preach these faiths to his countrymen. In

the same way, the theologian who will make the convincing presentation of Christ to his countrymen will be a Japanese, familiar with the ways of thought of his own people, and using the illustrations with which they are familiar. The theologian from Europe or America can be but the forerunner of the Japanese prophet, and as the latter increases, the former must be content to decrease.

A very notable step forward has recently been taken by the Catholic Mission in this country. The Marianist Community has been long and favourably known in Japan as among the leaders of Christian education, and its schools at Tokyo, Yokohama, Osaka, and Nagasaki have won for them and their methods the confidence alike of foreigners and of natives. At the suggestion of the Catholic Bishop of Nagasaki, the head of the Community, the Rev. Abbé Heinrich, is about to start, in the village of Urakami, near Nagasaki, a place full of Christian associations, a school which is (we may hope) destined to form the beginning of a true "school of the prophets" for this country.

This institution, the Apostolical School of Urakami, is based on the model of a similar school in Belgium. One of its departments will be a seminary for the training of those who wish to enter the priesthood. In another, more definite training will be given for the special fields of priestly work. In a third, teachers will be prepared to meet the requirements of the Japanese Department of Education, so that the Church may

be able to reap all the advantages possible from the educational system, and to do its best educationally for the people to whom it is sent. It is a noble scheme, more comprehensive, and more daring, and therefore, perhaps, more statesmanlike, than any scheme which has yet been devised by any body of Christian missionaries in Japan. The Catholic Church is to be congratulated on having been able to float so excellent an institution, and all those who are really interested in the work of Catholic missions will watch the experiment with eager attention and interest.

The Society of Mary furnishes the teaching staff and faculty, and Father Heinrich and his brethren so thoroughly understand the circumstances of the case, and the needs of Japan, that there need be no fear on that score. The institution will be well managed and run on wise lines, and although I have ventured to give, as it were, a prophetic outline of what it will ultimately aim at accomplishing, the wisdom of its founders will, for the present, be shown by a very modest inception of work.

But the Society of Mary is not in a position to furnish the necessary funds for the institution; for it has more men just now than it has money to dispose of. The school has, therefore, been started as a venture of faith, in the hope that the same good Providence which has in the last few years enabled the Society to keep up all its work outside of France, in spite of the adverse circumstances into which it has fallen, and which has enabled it to establish successfully another

venture of faith, the school at Yokohama, will not now desert the Fathers in this most necessary undertaking.

"He that hath, to him shall be given." The Marianist Fathers *have* faith, courage, industry, devotion . . . is it too much to hope that to them there may be given a sufficient portion of Catholic charity? It is, humanly speaking, a case of now or never if Japan is to be won for the Catholic Church, and true faith should lead us to work for Christ as hard as though we had none to depend on but ourselves, and, having done our little all, to trust God to supply the rest.

"Consideremus invicem in provocationem caritatis et bonorum operum."

EPILOGUE

EACH day the Master gives his hands their work,
Who labour at his forge. 'Mid cares of life,
And din of toil, foul smoke and choking dust,
And ponderous clash of vast machinery,
In sweat and grime, they labour at the forge,
Dragging the red-hot mass from furnace-mouths
And welding it with mighty hammer-strokes.
Confined from hour to hour within their sheds,
Nought know they of the glory; but the steel,
Wrought to keen blades and sharp by Master-arms,
Shall, in their sons' hands, lead to Victory.

Show Thy Servants Thy Work.

Printed by R. & R. CLARK, LIMITED, *Edinburgh.*

By H. FIELDING HALL.

Extra Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

THE SOUL OF A PEOPLE

ACADEMY.—"An exceedingly interesting book. . . . We wish we had space to quote the abundant, instructive, and fascinating information contained in this charming book."

MORNING POST.—"The book sets one thinking; every chapter is instructive, and Mr. Fielding Hall has assumed the right attitude in endeavouring to see things from within rather than from without, and has entered as far, perhaps, as it is possible for an outsider to enter into the soul of the people."

GUARDIAN.—"A very fascinating book. . . . Without a dull page from start to finish."

8vo. 10*s. net.*

THE INWARD LIGHT

DAILY TELEGRAPH.—"It is a book the beauty and significance of which can scarcely be described in a few sentences; it should be illustrated by extracts from chapter after chapter. The author has got near to understanding the secret of the East. . . . Mr. Hall has placed us newly in his debt by giving us a further work of remarkable freshness and great literary charm, one which most sympathetic readers will find, as we have said, really fascinating."

ACADEMY.—"Mr. Hall has written what is in many ways a memorable book. . . . Every one who, like Thoreau, finds the history of the world's religions the most interesting reading, should on no account fail to read 'The Inward Light.'"

WESTMINSTER GAZETTE.—"The book is full of atmosphere and interest, and through feeling the poetic charm of the people we get nearer to understanding their religion."

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

8vo.

BUDDHIST ESSAYS

BY

PAUL DAHLKE

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

BY

BHIKKHU SĪLĀCĀRA

CONTENTS

I. The Life of the Buddha.
II. A Brief Survey of the Leading Doctrines of Buddhism.
III. Some Characteristics of Buddhism.
IV. Pessimism and Sorrow.
V. Nibbāna.
VI. God.
VII. Kamma, the Judge of the World.
VIII. Morality in Buddhism.
IX. Charity.
X. Knowledge.
XI. After Death.
XII. The Specific in Buddhism.
XIII. The Law of the Middle Path.
XIV. Asceticism.
XV. Women.
XVI. Beginning and End—The Two Riddles of the World.
XVII. Miracle.
XVIII. The Elements.
XIX. Summary of the Historical Development of Buddhism.
XX. The World-Mission of Buddhism.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.